

HIS TROOPS ENTER GERMANY

The next stage of the offensive came in October with the capture of Aachen and the bloody battle of the Hürtgen Forest in November. The forest, a major element in Hitler's Siegfried line defense, was one point where the German Army turned and fought after the headlong retreat that followed the Normandy breakout.

From November 1944 to February 1945, General Hodges' 1st Army struggled to break the stubborn Wehrmacht resistance in the rugged, snow-covered forest. Seventeen American divisions were committed against a Wehrmacht force nearly as large. Seventy thousand German and American soldiers died in the woods.

"It was one of the most bitterly contested areas in the European theater," Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower wrote in his memoirs.

Meanwhile, in mid-December 1944, Field Marshal Gerd von Rundstedt breached the Allied positions in what became known as the Battle of the Bulge. After 2 weeks of bitter fighting in the Ardennes in freezing weather, the Germans' last-ditch offensive was thrown back and the 1st Army resumed its offensive.

On March 7, the 1st Army reached the Rhine through the ruins of Cologne. Then elements of the 9th Armored Division captured, intact, the Remagen Bridge over the Rhine, thus giving General Hodges a firm bridgehead on the east bank of the Rhine, without a bloody, contested crossing.

The 1st Army then moved east and north with a circling movement, and after joining forces with the 9th Army, captured 300,000 prisoners in the Ruhr. The 1st Army then drove to the Elbe, where it made the first contact with Soviet troops, at Torgau.

Born in Perry, Ga., on January 5, 1887, Courtney Hodges always wanted to be a military man. He was elated, after finishing high school, to get an appointment to West Point, the U.S. Military Academy. However, he had troubles with geometry and had to leave. After a year of clerking in a Georgia grocery store, he joined the Army in 1906 as a private.

Three years later, now a sergeant, he entered a competitive examination and was commissioned a second lieutenant. He served with General Pershing in Mexico from March 1916 to February 1917. In World War I, he served as regimental commander with the 6th Infantry Regiment and fought in the St. Mihiel and Meuse-Argonne offensives.

One source of great satisfaction to him was the fact that he returned to West Point as an instructor in the department of tactics in 1920. He was the first nongraduate to serve as an instructor.

SERVED IN PHILIPPINES

Between the wars he made several tours of duty at the Army's schools, including the War College in Washington. A short while later he was assigned to the 7th Infantry at Vancouver Barracks in the State of Washington. He next served in the Philippines and returned to the United States in 1938 to become assistant commandant and later commandant at the Infantry School, Fort Benning, Ga.

In 1941, then a brigadier general, he was assigned to the office of the chief of infantry in Washington. He became acting chief, then chief of infantry. In 1942 General Hodges activated the X Corps as a part of the 3d Army and later became 3d Army commander at Fort Sam Houston, Tex. A year later he was ordered abroad as deputy commander to Gen. Omar N. Bradley, who was then commander of the 1st Army. On August 1, 1944, the general took over 1st Army as General Bradley was put in command of the 12th Army group. General Hodges became a full general on April 15, 1945.

After World War II, General Hodges came with the 1st Army headquarters to Governors

Island. He retired here January 31, 1949, and moved to San Antonio.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CUT IN SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM HAMPERS ONE OF GREAT SOCIETY'S NEW PROGRAMS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, today in discussing the Bureau of the Budget's recent phony economy move cutting back funds for the special milk program for schoolchildren—funds appropriated by Congress—I would like to examine the cutback's impact on one very important new society program.

This Congress passed a revolutionary education bill last year—the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. The purpose of the act, and I quote, is to "provide financial assistance to local educational agencies serving areas with concentrations of children from low-income families to expand and improve their educational programs which contribute particularly to meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children."

Mr. President, this purpose is ill served by cutting back Federal funds for the special milk program. Studies show that when the price of milk to schoolchildren is increased by even 1 cent, and such an increase will occur in some areas because of the Federal cutback, it is the children of the poor who go without first. These are the very children which this Congress has done so much to help through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

Some of my colleagues may say: "What does drinking 1 or 2 half pints of milk a day have to do with good grades?" Not much, is my answer, when the child eats well at home. But when the big meal of the day is eaten at school, when parents are too poor to afford milk for their children, then that extra half pint or two can make all the difference in the world in a child's ability to concentrate and learn.

In the words of Earl Langkop, director of the Legislative Committee of the American School Food Service Association:

"You can't teach a hungry child" is no idle slogan. The furnishing of adequate and proper nutrition to schoolchildren is a vital part of any school program.

Mr. President, I hope the Bureau of the Budget takes this fact into account and frees the \$3 million it has withheld from funds appropriated for the school milk program. But until these funds are used to put more of Nature's perfect food into the schooltime diet of our schoolchildren, especially those who are educationally deprived, this Senator will continue to daily discuss the foolishness of the Bureau's action.

And once again, Mr. President, do not forget that this cutback in funds does not save the taxpayer a penny. Money not spent to buy milk for schoolchildren will be spent to put the same milk in storage under price support laws.

VIETNAM

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on the subject of Vietnam, yesterday I had occasion to question whether the news story in the New York Times suggesting that the President was going to impose a deadline on his peace drive was accurate. I am glad to see today that Presidential Press Secretary Bill Moyers has denied this story, which was given currency by the faceless and anonymous sources at the intermediate levels of the Pentagon and the State Department who leak stories of this kind. This morning Mr. Moyers denied the truth of the story. The White House said that no deadline had been set for ending President Johnson's peace offensive.

One gentleman representing the administration who does not seek anonymity and does not object to being quoted is Mr. Arthur Goldberg, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, who is quoted in today's New York Times as saying that the peace drive will reach fruition. Our Ambassador to the United Nations, for whom I have almost unbounded admiration, is quoted in this article as saying the U.S. offensive for peace in Vietnam is "bound to reach fruition." He said that the U.S. peace offensive begun by President Johnson late last month had already succeeded in convincing the world that America wants peace. He said:

I am convinced that it is bound to reach fruition, if not now, then in time to come.

He said that with patience peace can be attained if Americans endure the ordeal of patience. The United States, he said, has not yet received a response from Hanoi on proposals to end the war in Vietnam. In this respect, he said:

We can still not report success or failure.

I still believe that all efforts to reach success must continue.

In this connection, James Reston, well-known associate editor for the New York Times, last night commented on our policy in Vietnam. He asserted that the war in Vietnam should be pursued as one of limited objectives, and that the correct way was the middle way—and I think he is correct—which rules out intensification of the war, or peace on terms that would lose the country.

Mr. Reston points out, as I have before, that the United States can defend the perimeter of Saigon and the coastal areas where most of the people of South Vietnam live. This is very different than searching out the enemy through the elephant grass.

As I have said before, I am unalterably opposed to trading American coffins for useless jungle real estate in Vietnam.

U.S. POLICY IN VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, tomorrow I shall make a major speech in opposition to our policy in Vietnam. I have noted the remarks of praise which the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] has just expressed concerning Ambassador Goldberg. Suffice it to say that I shall be filled with the same enthusiasm about the work of our Ambassador to the United Nations, Ambassador Goldberg, when he makes it perfectly clear that our policy

January 18, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

4

appropriations should be made immediately.

It is not my intention to substitute the direct loan program for the disaster loan program of section 7(b) of the Small Business Act. In fact, section 7(b) cannot apply to a situation such as existed in New York City, for it does not satisfy the disaster requirements of that section. However, it is generally agreed that section 7(a) is properly suited to meet the economic situation which existed in New York City.

On January 5, 1966, I wrote to Mr. Davis urging him to take immediate action to make direct loans under section 7(a) available to the people of New York City out of any fund the agency might have or to seek additional appropriations when Congress reconvened. The Administration 2 days later made available the \$20 million previously mentioned.

The SBA cannot be allowed to sit idly by and wait for these economic disasters to arise elsewhere. The agency must be prepared to meet any future contingency. Yet, I am aware of no action on the part of the SBA to seek supplemental appropriations at this time. According, as another step in the continuing effort to strengthen the small business loan program, I have advised the President of the seriousness of the situation and have asked his help in the matter.

I ask my colleagues to join with me in seeking prompt action by the Administration in order to place the small business direct loan program on its feet.

SARGENT SHRIVER'S IMPERISHABLE CONTRIBUTION TO THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the departure of Sargent Shriver from the Peace Corps is an appropriate time to remind the Senate of the remarkable contribution of this unusual man.

If any American program has clearly planted the taproots of peace in the world, it is the Peace Corps. Throughout the world and throughout America the Peace Corps is cheered as a happy combination of idealistic dedication and practical good sense.

It has not only been established on the basic principle of winning peace by helping people help themselves to a better life, but it has also been initiated and administered in a brilliant manner.

This is where Sargent Shriver comes in. How many beautiful and idealistic plans have foundered because of incompetent, feeble, and uninspired administration.

In an international world of jealous competition, featured by militant military competition, the Peace Corps might easily have become another casualty of the cold war and the cold heart.

But under Sargent Shriver's policies of discriminating and enthusiastic recruitment, his determination not to let his men become involved in diplomatic or intelligence activities overseas—their only job being to help people help themselves—the Peace Corps has become our great international asset.

As the Foreign Minister of Thailand said:

This important idea, the most powerful idea in recent times, of a Peace Corps, of youth mingling, living, working with youth—and that it should come from the mightiest Nation on earth, the United States. Many of us who did not know about the United States thought of this great Nation, endowed with great material strength and many powerful weapons. But how many of us know that in the United States ideas and ideals are also powerful?

Sargent Shriver has served his nation—and, indeed, all mankind—well in the Peace Corps. As he departs it, he richly deserves his nation's grateful thanks.

DEATH OF GEN. COURTNEY HODGES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Gen. Courtney Hodges died on Sunday. I happen to have followed closely General Hodges' brilliant military career because he was the cousin of my wife, the former Ellen Hodges.

General Hodges, like so many of his close relatives, was a quiet, gentle person of strong character. As the New York Times said in its obituary, he was a southern gentleman.

General Hodges' career should inspire many Americans who encounter disappointments and setbacks in their lives. His dearest ambition was for a military career, and he enthusiastically accepted an appointment to West Point, but was forced to leave after a year, because of difficulties with the mysteries of geometry.

But Courtney Hodges refused to quit. He entered the Army as a private, and worked his way through the ranks to become a general and commanding officer of the 1st Army in World War II. He directed the brilliant campaign of that army from August 1, 1944, through some of the toughest fighting in World War II, juggling corps and divisions as he chased the enemy. Paris fell to the 1st Army, then it went across the Aisne and the Marne through Belgium. Hodges' army was the first U.S. troops to enter Germany. It captured Aachen, won the bloody battle of the Hurtgen Forest, marched through the ruins of Cologne, across the Rhine over the famous Remagen Bridge, and then joined the 8th Army, capturing 300,000 prisoners.

General Hodges retired as a full general in 1949. He has left his family and his Nation a proud legacy.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial on Courtney Hodges' career published in today's Washington Post, and an article from this morning's New York Times be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
Jan. 18, 1966]

COURTNEY HICKS HODGES

Gen. Courtney H. Hodges, who died on Sunday at 79, will always occupy a place of high honor in the ranks of his country's military heroes. He assumed command of the great 1st Army in August 1944, shortly after the Normandy invasion, and led it to a series of dazzling victories. It was the

first American force to enter Paris, the first to march on German soil, the first to cross the Rhine, and the first to make a juncture with the Russians at the Elbe.

At the age of 18 General Hodges was dropped from West Point because of difficulty with mathematics and told that he was not meant to be a soldier. Had he not ignored that judgment and enlisted in the Army as a private, the Nation would have lost one of its greatest infantry generals.

Perhaps the most fitting tribute to Courtney Hodges was paid by his wartime commander, Gen. Omar N. Bradley.

In "A Soldier's Story," Bradley writes of General Hodges as a "spare, soft-voiced Georgian without temper, drama or visible emotion" who tended to be "left behind in the European headline sweepstakes." Yet he emerges as "a general's general." "For Hodges," Bradley concludes, "successfully blended dexterity and commonsense in such equal portions as to produce a magnificently balanced command. I had implicit faith in his judgment, in his skill and restraint."

[From the New York Times, Jan. 18, 1966]
GEN. COURTNEY HODGES, 79, DIES—LED FIRST ARMY IN WORLD WAR II—HEADED DRIVE FROM NORMANDY THAT REACHED THE ELBE—WEST POINT DROPOUT

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., January 16.—Gen. Courtney H. Hodges, commander of the 1st Army in its victorious drive through France and Germany in World War II, died today at Brooke General Hospital. He was 79 years old.

A hospital spokesman said the retired general, who had lived here since 1949, died of a heart attack.

He is survived by his widow, Mrs. Mildred Lee Hodges; two brothers and five sisters, all of Georgia.

A SOUTHERN GENTLEMAN

Courtney Hicks Hodges rose from a private to general, after dropping out of the U.S. Military Academy in 1905 because he had difficulty with geometry. In more than 40 years of military duty that included service with Gen. John J. Pershing in Mexico and as commander of the 1st Army in Europe in 1944, General Hodges carved a distinguished career.

He was a small, spry, quiet Southern gentleman who called his officers by their first names, but still remained rather distant. "He isn't the kind of fellow who has a nickname," a longtime associate once said. "Nobody ever calls him anything but Courtney."

General Hodges was neither a backslapper nor a seeker of publicity. As a result, he usually came off second best in headlines, overshadowed by such colorful generals as George S. Patton, Jr., and Britain's Bernard Law Montgomery.

"Georgie and I were old friends," General Hodges once said. "He had one job with his army; the 1st had another. We were a zonal army. We just slugged. Publicity? Some people just naturally attract attention—and all my friends tell me I look more like a schoolteacher than a general."

It was on August 1, 1944, 2 months after participating in the D-day landings in Europe, that General Hodges took over the 1st Army. His drive into Germany was one of the most dramatic campaigns of the war and an example of unorthodox leadership, as the general juggled corps and divisions while chasing the enemy.

Paris fell to the 1st Army on August 25, 1944. Passing through and around the city, General Hodges' forces moved across the Aisne and the Marne and reached the Belgian frontier on September 2. They liberated Liège on the 8th, crossed Luxembourg and reached the German border on the 11th—the first U.S. troops to enter Germany.

January 18, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

449

is going to be one of seeking negotiations for peace in Vietnam not on a bilateral arrangement between the United States and our enemies in this unconstitutional war, but on the basis of sitting down at a negotiating table with representatives of noncombatants at the head of that table representing the United Nations.

Until that is done, I say to the Ambassador of the United States in the United Nations that I am not at all impressed by the discussion taking place behind the scenes in the United Nations. It is about time that we go to the United Nations directly on the issue of peace in Asia in accordance with the procedures set out in the charter.

NATIONAL WILD RIVERS SYSTEM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I announce at this point that in respect to the debate which is to take place this afternoon in regard to the wild rivers bill, the Senator from Idaho and I have tentatively agreed to go along with a series of proposed amendments that will protect the objectives of the wild rivers bill and at the same time give my State the protection to which I think it is clearly entitled in respect to the matter of condemnation and exchange powers granted to the Secretaries. Also as to the matter of encouraging the counties to develop a county zoning program we will suggest a proposed amendment. I believe these amendments are vitally necessary to protect Federal interests as well as the interests of the people of Oregon in connection with sound public land policies in my State of Oregon.

I hope that before the afternoon is over our proposed amendments will be approved by the Senate.

I wish at this time to express my very deep appreciation to the Senator from Idaho for his fairness and willingness to accept amendments that will iron out in a fair and satisfactory manner the major objections I raised yesterday.

I believe that the last thing that the Senator from Idaho said in debate last night, as the RECORD will show, was that he hoped that the Senator from Oregon and he could reach a concordable compromise. I believe we have one to offer this afternoon.

OUR COMMITMENT IN VIETNAM

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I notice in today's press that it is the intention of the President and the Secretary of Defense to strengthen American forces in Vietnam.

It seems to me—and I believe the majority of Senators believe—that a part of a continuing struggle has been in existence for 20 years, and perhaps longer, if one considers it in a broader sense.

We propose to see that those who do not want to be enslaved by Communist aggression or any other kind of aggression are helped and supported when they seek to resist that type of aggression. It is our feeling that to permit aggression to succeed in a place of this sort is to set the stage for a bigger fight somewhere else.

Accordingly, when people seek to resist aggression and we give our commitment to help them, it seems important that the aggression should not be permitted to succeed, because to do so would mean an expansion, and in this case it would mean eventually the loss of southeast Asia, and eventually all of Asia, and eventually perhaps the loss of more than that.

We believe that the best hope for an honorable and lasting peace in the world is the stopping of aggression in the areas where it starts. That is what we are doing.

It is important that in undertaking that task we not encourage the aggressor by confronting him with less force than is needed to stop his aggression and throw it back. We are doing that. Perhaps we are not doing enough of it.

I am pleased that the President is determined to see that our efforts will succeed. An honorable peace is what we seek. But we do not seek any peace that would permit enslavement of those who would like to be on the side of the free world, and we do not propose to negotiate any sort of peace that would permit those who fight for freedom on our side to be hunted down and slaughtered, as we have seen happen when communism has taken over in other areas of the world.

TRIBUTE TO EVERARD H. SMITH

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to an editorial which appeared in the Hampton (N.H.) Union for January 13, entitled "Two Trillion Dollars and Everard H. Smith."

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Two TRILLION DOLLARS AND EVERARD H. SMITH

Two trillion dollars is still beyond the comprehension of most of us and there aren't many people in these parts who ever heard of Everard H. Smith.

Senators AIKEN and PROUTY could tell you who Smith is.

So could Senator NORRIS COTTON.

The late Senator Styles Bridges could have told you all about Smith just as he told you when he was alive that billions add up to trillions.

Smith retired from his job down in Washington the other day.

The Washington newspapers carried his picture and a little story about him. It is possible that some newspaper outside of Washington may have mentioned that Smith was getting through but we doubt it. They wouldn't know Smith and neither would they understand the importance of the work he has been doing under the dome of our National Capitol for 52 years.

This Mr. Smith went to Washington in 1913. That was before we were born. He went to work for the then U.S. Senator Martin, of Virginia, who was chairman of the Appropriations Committee. Martin hired Smith "to do some little odds and ends around the office for awhile." Smith stayed on to become chief clerk to the committee and in the course of 52 years handled appropriation bills totaling \$2 trillion.

Smith was one of the ablest public serv-

vants we have ever known. He occupied his high place and did his important work humbly. He was respected by Senators of both political parties and it mattered not whether the chairman of the committee from time to time was Republican or Democrat, the chairman leaned heavily upon Smith and enjoyed Smith's allegiance.

We have a thought that Everard H. Smith will find his way up Capitol Hill many times in the future sort of by force of habit. We hope this will be the case. But whether he is at home with his slippers and pipe or basking in the friendships of the Hill, we send to Everard from the winter beauty of New England our commendation and best wishes.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, this is a moving tribute to a loyal and dedicated public servant who gave 52 years of his life, as the writer suggests, in effective and yet unsung labor. As a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I share fully in this fine expression of commendation and good wishes.

INDIANA COLLEGE STUDENTS SUPPORT ADMINISTRATION'S POLICY

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, college students of Indiana in large numbers recently have expressed strong approval of the administration's policies in Vietnam. A list signed by over 16,000 students certifying this support was presented to Governor Branigin late in December and a number of public rallies for the same purpose have been held on various campuses.

Typical of the latter was a gathering at Purdue University just before the Christmas holidays where more than 700 students and staff members assembled outdoors in freezing temperatures for an enthusiastic session. Professors Kenneth Kofmehl and James Dornan delivered well-received talks stressing the soundness of present policy and the dangers of appeasement. In order that other Members of Congress may read the descriptions of this important rally, I ask unanimous consent that articles from the *Purdue Exponent*, *Lafayette Courier-Journal*, *Indianapolis Star*, *Indianapolis News*, and the *New York Times* be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the *Purdue Exponent*, Dec. 17, 1965]
RALLY SUPPORTS U.S. VIETNAM STAND—
PROFESSORS DORAN, KOEHLER LECTURE
TORCHLIGHT GATHERING

(By Joe Bankoff and Peter Wellman)

A frostbitten crowd of an estimated 700 students and staff last night cheered their approval of the U.S. policy in Vietnam at the State's first torchlight rally for that purpose. From a kerosene lighted stage just north of the campus armory Profs. James E. Dornan and Kenneth Kofmehl delivered proclamations of why the United States must remain in Vietnam.

VOLUNTEER BAND

A two-piece volunteer band played as the crowd began to gather at about 6:30 p.m. in spite of the freezing temperature and light snow.

Alan Brubaker, president of the university's Young Republican Club, opened the

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

January 18, 1966

rally by informing the crowd that yesterday morning he had personally presented Indiana Gov. Roger Branigin with 16,000 signatures of Indiana college students who support the administration's current policy in Vietnam.

GOVERNOR SUPPORTS

"The Governor gave his complete support to this rally and to other similar activities," said Brubaker.

Prof. Kenneth Kofmehl told the crowd that for freedom of speech to work there must be full expression of diverse points of view. "We cannot permit an articulate minority to convey the impression that they represent the views of all."

In supporting the administration's policy in Vietnam, Professor Kofmehl noted that the Chinese Communists are looking next to Thailand where they have announced support for Thailand Patriotic Front's effort to liberate Thailand.

"We do not have to speculate about the plans of the Chinese Communists, they have obligingly provided us with a clear statement of their plans for world conquest. After Thailand will come other countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America until we are surrounded by Communist countries and ripe for this treatment ourselves," exclaimed Professor Kofmehl.

SOUND PREMISES

"The administration's policy in Vietnam is based on sound premises. Appeasement led to a world war in which 40 million people died. In executing current strategy, our administration has held out the carrot as well as used the stick.

"There is no guarantee that our policy will succeed. It requires wit and will to succeed. However, appeasement and peace at any price will surely fail and find us encircled and helpless," Professor Kofmehl declared.

STUDENTS APPLAUD

To the enthusiastic applause of his student audience he challenged, "Yours has been characterized as the committed generation, the generation seeking involvement. What nobler cause is there for you to commit yourselves to than freedom for ourselves and other freedom loving peoples of the world? Hence I urge you to support our administration's wise and brave effort to do this."

Professor Dornan opened by stating, "meetings of this kind constitute an important part of the decisionmaking process of a free society." He then switched to biting reprimands of such groups "of the far left as SDS, and the Dubois, and the May 3 movement."

Then delving directly into the war in Vietnam, Professor Dornan said, "since 1917 and Lenin's rise to power in the Soviet Union, Communist nations have waged unremitting war against freedom at home, and pursued unrelentlessly policies of expansionism abroad." Dornan continued, "the war in Vietnam may well be the most decisive struggle of the entire cold war period."

Professor Dornan concluded, "if we do not now raise the costs of guerrilla war, subversion, and indirect aggression to such a level that the Chinese find such activities unprofitable, then we can look for such conflicts to break out."

Dornan returned to the platform to state we must help the Vietnamese from "fearing the midnight knock on the door and the darkness at noon."

The rally was under the joint sponsorship of the Young Republicans, the Young Democrats and the Young Americans for Freedom.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 18, 1965]

WAR ROLE BACKED AT PURDUE RALLY—STUDENTS CHEER PROFESSOR DEFENDING U.S. POLICY

LAFAYETTE, IND., December 17.—About 750 Purdue University students gathered in freez-

ing temperatures and light snow last night to back the U.S. policy in Vietnam.

The torchlight rally on a campus parking lot was sponsored by Young Republicans, Young Democrats and Young Americans for Freedom. Signs that sprinkled the rally read, "We Support the Policy in Vietnam" and "Stop the Red Tide."

Students cheered when a political science professor, James E. Dornan, said:

"We believe our effort in Vietnam is just, right, and necessary," Professor Dornan, faculty sponsor for the Young Republican chapter at Purdue, added:

"We will support the administration policy only as long as it remains faithful to our commitment in southeast Asia."

BRAVE AND WISE EFFORT

Kenneth Kofmehl, Young Democrat faculty sponsor, urged support of "our administration's brave and wise effort" in Vietnam. He said the lesson of the 1930's "proved we cannot avoid war by appeasement."

Meanwhile, Gov. Roger D. Branigin thanked the Indiana representatives of the National Student Committee for the Defense of Vietnam for the committee's efforts supporting America's position in Vietnam.

"You deserve a lot of credit," he told leaders in Indianapolis after they had shown him samples of petitions that about 16,000 students on Indiana campuses had signed.

Similar petitions gathered throughout the country will be sent to the White House.

[From the Lafayette (Ind.) Journal & Courier, Dec. 17, 1965]

STUDENTS CHEER U.S. ACTION IN VIETNAM AT TORCHLIGHT RALLY

A crowd of 750 Purdue University students cheered in support of U.S. action in Vietnam in a chilly, snow-flecked torchlight rally Thursday night.

"This is not a debate—this is to show how American students feel," said Alan Brubaker, Kokomo, president of the cosponsoring Purdue chapter of Young Republicans.

Brubaker said the rally had the support of Gov. Roger D. Branigin and Representative JOHN BRAFEMAS, Democrat, of Indiana, and was the first such rally in Indiana.

Banners raised at the half-hour rally on a parking lot near the Purdue Armory said, "We Support the Policy in Vietnam" and "Stop the Red Tide."

Speaking from a torchlit platform on the parking lot, James E. Dornan, Purdue political science professor, said:

"We believe our effort in Vietnam is just, right, and necessary. But we will support the administration policy only as long as it remains faithful to our commitment in southeast Asia."

Unless communism's thrusts are stopped there, Dornan added, "wars could break out all over—even in our own backyard in Latin America."

Kenneth Kofmehl, another Purdue political science professor, told the rally that events of the 1930's proved "we cannot avoid world war by appeasement." He urged support of "our administration's brave and wise efforts."

Dornan is faculty sponsor of the Young Republicans. Kofmehl is sponsor of the Young Democrats, another sponsoring group, along with the Young Americans for Freedom.

PETITIONS PRESENTED

Meanwhile Thursday, Brubaker said he and James D. Blythe, Indiana chairman of the National Student Committee for the Defense of Vietnam, presented Governor Branigin with petitions signed by 16,000 Indiana college students supporting the Vietnam war.

Of this total, about 2,000 signatures were those of Purdue University students.

Four students met with Branigin for more than an hour at the statehouse at Indianapolis.

The petition read:

"We believe that the war in Vietnam is part of a general Communist effort to dominate all of southeast Asia."

"We believe that the cause of the war rests clearly with Communist leaders in Hanoi, Peiping, and among the Vietcong."

"We believe that the so-called peace demonstrators who are opposing our role in Vietnam are encouraging the Communists to continue their aggressive actions in South Vietnam and, in turn, all of southeast Asia."

"We believe that the overwhelming majority of young Americans join us in supporting the efforts of our Government to oppose Communist aggression in Vietnam."

[From the Indianapolis Star, Dec. 17, 1965] **PURDUE STUDENTS RALLY, SHIVER, BACK VIET POLICY**

WEST LAFAYETTE, IND.—Some 750 Purdue University students held a torchlight rally in Vietnam.

The rally, on a parking lot near the ROTC armory on campus, included students carrying banners, "We Support the Policy In Vietnam," "Stop the Red Tide," and others.

The students, shivering in the chilly weather and light snow cheered Purdue political science Prof. James E. Dornan, who said, "We believe our effort in Vietnam is just, right and necessary. We will support the administration policy only as long as it remains faithful to our commitment in southeast Asia."

Professor Dornan is faculty sponsor for the Young Republican chapter on campus, one of the rally sponsors.

Kenneth Kofmehl, faculty sponsor for the Young Democrats on campus, another sponsor of the rally, urged support of "our administration's brave and wise effort" in Vietnam and added the lesson of the 1930's "proved we cannot avoid war by appeasement."

Other sponsors of the rally were the Young Americans for Freedom. Alan Brubaker of Kokomo, president of the Young GOP chapter, presided at the rally and introduced speakers.

[From the Indianapolis News, Dec. 17, 1965] **SEVEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY BACK VIET POLICY AT RALLY**

WEST LAFAYETTE, IND.—About 750 Purdue University students gathered in freezing temperatures and light snow last night to back U.S. policy in Vietnam.

The torchlight rally on a campus parking lot was sponsored by Young Republicans, Young Democrats, and Young Americans for Freedom.

Signs that sprinkled the rally read, "We Support the Policy in Vietnam" and "Stop the Red Tide."

Students cheered when one of the speakers, political science Prof. James E. Dornan, said:

"We believe our effort in Vietnam is just, right, and necessary."

Dornan, faculty sponsor for the Young GOP chapter at Purdue, added, "We will support the administration policy only as long as it remains faithful to our commitment in southeast Asia."

Kenneth Kofmehl, Young Democrats faculty sponsor, urged support of "our administration's brave and wise effort" in Vietnam. He said the lesson of the 1930's "proved we cannot avoid war by appeasement."

Meanwhile, Gov. Roger D. Branigan thanked Hoosier representatives of the National Student Committee for the Defense of Vietnam for their efforts supporting America's position in Vietnam.

"You deserve a lot of credit," he told leaders in Indianapolis after they showed him samples of petitions which about 16,000 students on Indiana campuses have signed.

January 18, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

451

Such petitions gathered throughout the country will be sent to the White House.

WALTER LIPPMANN'S ASTUTE ANALYSIS OF THE U.S. DILEMMA IN VIETNAM

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in a series of recent articles, Mr. Walter Lippmann, in his usual astute manner, has penetratingly analyzed the bases for U.S. involvement in Vietnam and the future ahead if escalation in our military commitment takes place.

Pointing out the hard decisions facing President Johnson, Mr. Lippmann stated on January 17, 1966, in Newsweek:

A sine qua non for any possibility of bringing the undeclared war in Vietnam to the conference table is a continuation of the policy of not bombing North Vietnam. That policy should continue.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at the conclusion of my remarks the following articles by Walter Lippmann: an article entitled "The President in the Morass" which appeared in the Washington Post on January 4, 1966; an article entitled "The Mansfield Report" which appeared in the Washington Post on January 11, 1966; and, an article entitled "The Next Move," which appeared in the Washington Post on January 6, 1966; and, an article entitled "The President's Hard Decision," which appeared in Newsweek on January 17, 1966, and "The Guns-Versus-Butter Stereotype" which appeared in the Washington Post on January 18, 1966.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 11, 1966]
TODAY AND TOMORROW: THE MANSFIELD REPORT

(By Walter Lippmann)

The return of Congress marks the end of the period in which the President has had the unquestioning support of some 60 to 70 percent of the people. It has always been remarkable, as in law and public morals it has been unseemly, that this country should be committed to a war which has never been explained except in resounding generalities, and has never been debated seriously. This surreptitious war has been feasible because the people are disposed to trust the President and to assume that in a question of war and peace in a distant continent he is in a position to know more than they do.

But now there is a new element in the situation. His conduct of the war has been tested for a year on the battlefields of southeast Asia. What the public has been told about the strategy and the prospects of this war is now being measured by the actual results, which the people are beginning to find out about. The crucial turning point has come with the publication of the report which contains the findings of five Senators, led by Senator MANSFIELD and including Senators AIKEN, MUSKIE, BOGGS, and INOUYE. Here for the first time we have a report on the war which is responsible, informed, and trustworthy. Except for the reports of a few enterprising and independent newspapermen, the American public has had to depend on information made available in official briefings in Saigon and Washington.

The contradictions between the briefings and the facts, as they have gradually become visible, has undermined public confidence.

The grim fact is that by conducting the war furtively there has developed, as Ambassador Goldberg confessed only the other day, a crisis of credibility. People do not know what to believe about what they hear from the White House, the State Department, the Pentagon, and the public relations officers in Saigon. The only way to restore confidence in the truthfulness of officials is by subjecting the exercise to a thorough public debate. For such a debate the Mansfield report—which ought to have very much wider publication than it has yet had—supplies the material for opening the debate.

The main proposition which needs to be debated, and denied by the administration if it can deny it, is the finding of the Mansfield report that:

"The large-scale introduction of U.S. forces and their entry into combat has blunted but not turned back the drive of the Vietcong. The latter have responded to the increased American role with a further strengthening of their forces by local recruitment in the south and reinforcements from the north and a general stepping up of military activity. As a result the lines remain drawn in South Vietnam in substantially the same pattern as they were at the outset of the increased U.S. commitment."

After a year of escalated war, the results have brought the Senators to this reassertion of the classical American doctrine about Asian wars:

"If present trends continue, there is no assurance as to what ultimate increase in American military commitment will be required before the conflict is terminated. For the fact is that under present terms of reference and as the war has evolved, the question is not one of applying increased U.S. pressure to a defined military situation, but rather of pressing against a military situation which is, in effect, open ended."

This is simply another statement, in the concrete terms of the war in southeast Asia, of the doctrine which has until recently been American military doctrine—that the United States should not engage in a land war on the Asian continent because such a war will be, as the Mansfield report calls it, open ended. For there will always be more Asians in Asia than there can be Americans.

Our people are coming to realize that the war is open ended, that no matter how many troops we put ashore there will always be enough troops on the other side to keep the war going.

Since this means that a negotiated peace cannot be the kind of dictated peace which Senator DIRKSEN is still dreaming about, the President is finding himself under heavy pressure to bomb and blockade Hanoi and Haiphong, and thus make a quick, clean end of it. On the subject of victory through air power, the American people have been dangerously misinformed.

I say dangerously because the advocates of bigger bombing do not seem to realize how vulnerable are Saigon and the other ports to reprisals. In the congested cities and harbors which we hold there are the makings of another Pearl Harbor, and none of us should discount the danger. There cannot be much doubt that this is one of the subjects that Mr. Shelepin has been discussing in Hanoi.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 6, 1966]
TODAY AND TOMORROW: THE NEXT MOVE?

(By Walter Lippmann)

Through the fog of war which lies so heavily upon the scene, there may be discernible a certain amount of movement which holds some promise. There is no certainty about it. But, remembering Mr. Joseph Kraft's well-informed observation that communications between Hanoi and Washington are clogged and slow, I think that the public re-

action of Hanoi to the President's peace campaign which is just beginning to show above the surface, may at least indicate what the President might do next.

There are no indications that Hanoi will suddenly announce that it is ready for a peace conference. Nor is there any indication that Hanoi will withdraw its troops in the south or suspend the infiltration of more troops. We must expect that the Vietcong strength in the south will be maintained by Hanoi in a ratio suitable to successful guerrilla warfare. There may be a certain reduction in the tempo of violence, at least while the pause in the bombing continues. But there is nothing in the public record to indicate that a peace conference or a de facto truce is in sight.

What seems to be in sight is a period of diplomatic exchanges, carried on publicly at arm's length, carried on privately through intermediaries, and masked by bellicose rhetoric to appease and put off the opponents of a negotiated truce. The most interesting evidence here is, on our side, the letter from Ambassador Goldberg to the Secretary General of the United Nations; on the other side, there is the editorial which was published on January 3 in the North Vietnamese newspaper, Nhan Dan. This can be taken as an official commentary on the Johnson peace campaign.

The commentary is deliberately ambiguous, as must be expected of a government which has to maneuver between Peking, Moscow, and Washington. But through the ambiguity, the commentary can be read as a challenge to the President to prove that he does not mean what Hanoi thinks he means on two cardinal points. The commentary challenges him to disprove that he means to establish "a new type colony and military base of the United States and perpetuating the partition of Vietnam."

He is asked to prove, second, that he is not asking "the Vietcong—South Vietnamese liberation forces—to lay down their arms * * * and be placed under the rule of the Saigon regime."

The President has done well, I believe, to look beyond the angry language of the past and to proceed with the discussion of war aims and peace terms, which he has been offering since his Baltimore speech last April. He can assume that what Mr. Goldberg described as "discussions or negotiations without any prior conditions whatsoever" have actually started, not yet in the form of a conference but at long distance and, in part at least, publicly.

If that is where we are, then the time has come to proceed from press conferences, briefings, and informal speeches to formal diplomatic notes. The cardinal issues, as described by the Hanoi commentary, are, one, the conditions under which we shall withdraw our military forces from South Vietnam—and, two, the conditions, if any, under which the Vietcong may participate in the government of the country.

Because Ambassador Goldberg leaves our position on these two basic issues uncertain, further official definition of our war aims is called for.

I do not know whether the administration can agree within itself on such a definition of its war aims. But I think I do know that such a definition of our war aims on the two cardinal points is now indispensable to the maintenance of confidence at home and abroad.

Whatever the first response in Hanoi, the act of clarifying and defining our aims is a necessary part of the effort to move the war from the battlefield to the conference table. Even if we assume, as we had better do, that Hanoi will reply scornfully, the nub of the matter is that it should reply and thus find itself in a discussion about the shape of things to come.

It has often been said in Washington during the past year that we are listening, with our antenna well polished, for some response from Hanoi, and that we have never had any response. This official stance, that it takes two to discuss anything, overlooks the fact that a great power like the United States with its worldwide connections can force discussions by beginning the discussions and making it increasingly impossible for the other party to break them off.

If the President wants seriously to have discussions, he has made a good beginning with the Goldberg letter. If he perseveres, he will not go very long unanswered. Indeed, judging by the first reactions of Hanoi to the current peace campaign, there are reasons for thinking that the public discussions have begun and the task now is to continue them.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 4, 1966]

TODAY AND TOMORROW: THE PRESIDENT IN THE MORASS

(By Walter Lippmann)

There is no reason to doubt that the President is sincere in proclaiming to the whole world his desire to negotiate a peace in Vietnam. But sincerity is not the crux of the matter. The question is whether he recognizes the strategic realities of the military situation and is prepared to negotiate a truce which conforms with them. It cannot be a glorious truce.

If the President is not prepared to make his terms of peace consistent with the reality in southeast Asia, he is likely to find that our friends and our adversaries alike regard the whole spectacular business not as the action of a statesman but as the device of a showman.

Nevertheless, for the President the peace offensive is a critical turning point. It is not true, as so many suppose, that, if Peiping and Hanoi reject the offer to negotiate, the way will therefore be cleared and open for a general escalation of the war. The President will find that, while the planes will fly and the troops will march and Congress will vote the money, confidence in his leadership, both at home and abroad, will be deeply weakened unless he has defined his terms of peace.

As seen through the murk of Secretary Rusk's on and off the record press conferences, the Johnson administration has no firm and clear position on the central issues of the war. I realize that industrious newspapermen have been able to glean a collection of remarks which relate to the central issues—such as, whether we are prepared to leave South Vietnam under any conditions which are in fact realizable in the foreseeable future, and whether we are in fact willing to negotiate a truce with the main adversary in the field, the Vietcong. If these central points have been clarified by Mr. Harriman and the other emissaries, a great deal will have been accomplished. If they have not been clarified, the effort is not sufficiently serious to comport with the dignity of a great power. For a power like the United States cannot lose face by liquidating a miserable war. But it can lose face by fooling around with it.

Mr. Johnson knows that he is in a very grave crisis. For as he admitted in his year-end remarks, his great domestic accomplishments are jeopardized by his failure to achieve peace in Vietnam. It is worse than that. He is on the verge of making the kind of ruinous historical mistake which the Athenians made when they attacked Syracuse, which Napoleon and Hitler made when they attacked Russia. He is on the verge of entrapping this country in a war which can grow into a great war lasting for many years and promising no rational solution.

The President is in this predicament mainly because he has let himself be persuaded by very bad advice. The bad advice has been

the argument that the expansion of Chinese communism will be halted or quickened by the outcome of the fighting in South Vietnam. The notion that revolutionary wars can be stopped by fighting it out in South Vietnam has been the cherished illusion of the President's two principal advisers. Both Mr. Rusk and Mr. McNamara have committed themselves to the fallacy that South Vietnam is the Armageddon of the conflict with communism.

This misconceived war has in fact boomeranged. Its effect has been quite the opposite from what it was supposed to be. The country has been told that by proving our determination and our willingness to fight, we are arousing resistance to the expansion of Chinese communism.

But are we? If China is to be contained it will have to be done not only by the United States but by the containing power of Asia; namely, Pakistan, India, Japan, and the Soviet Union. Yet not one of these great powers of Asia is aligned with us. Quite the contrary. Our Vietnamese actions have driven the most powerful of all the containing states, the Soviet Union, into open opposition to us and, if we escalate enough, will drive it into some kind of military opposition.

Certainly it is essential that Communist China be contained until its revolutionary ardors have cooled and she has settled down to peaceable coexistence. But a serious policy of containing China would begin with a realization that China is a continental land power in Asia and if she is to be contained, it will have to be done primarily by the great powers of Asia, not by the United States alone.

What is more, serious policy for containing China would respect the basic geographical facts—that China is a land power and we are a sea power, that China is an elephant and we are a whale. During the past year or so China has had many failures and one conspicuous success. Geography was the determining factor in all of them. The Chinese failed in Africa, which is across the ocean and too far away. She outbluffed herself against India, which is also, in fact, too far away. She had a humiliating setback in Indonesia, which is separated from China by blue water and is not within her reach.

China's one great success has been that the greatest sea power has become bogged down in the morass of Indochina and would now be put to it to mount a counterrevolutionary effort anywhere else in this turbulent world. It is no wonder then that China will do all that she can to prevent us from extricating ourselves from the morass.

[From Newsweek, Jan. 17, 1966]
WALTER LIPPmann ON THE PRESIDENT'S HARD DECISION

After his most recent trip to South Vietnam, Secretary McNamara ventured to say that, as a result of our efforts, we have stopped losing the war. Perhaps he was referring to the fact that at the beginning of 1965 not only had the Saigonese Army lost control of the countryside with the exception of five or six cities, but the government in Saigon was disintegrating and was on the verge of making a deal with Hanoi.

During the past year there has been no significant improvement in the military situation. Once the American soldiers retire, the villages which are recovered from the Vietcong are quickly lost again. The balance of military power has not been changed in our favor. For as we have increased our own army, the adversary has increased his army, both by stepping up the infiltration from the north and by greater recruitment in the south. The one real change has been that the government in Saigon is now a dictatorship of four generals who are fully aware that personally they have every reason to avoid a truce and to continue the war.

So, the President finds himself no nearer,

and almost certainly further away from, his avowed objectives in Vietnam. He has been confronted with what he now describes, quite correctly, as "hard decisions." What are the hard decisions? At bottom, the President has to choose between a bigger war and an unattractive peace. He must decide either to launch a big American war in Asia, a war which could easily be bigger than the Korean war because it could so quickly involve both China and the Soviet Union, or to cut our losses by reducing his political and military objectives.

EXTEND THE WAR, OR SETTLE FOR LESS?

This is indeed a hard choice. A long war means heavy casualties. It means the disruption of the lives of another generation of young men. It means that the Nation will be distracted from the attempt to solve its own problems—such as the problems of the cities and the problems of the Negroes and the problems of industrial peace. It means once again, for the fourth time in this century, that the Nation will turn its attention from its own urgent affairs to a war abroad. It means also that this country will be diverted from the development of the Americas and from its vital national interests in Europe and Australasia.

The other choice open to the President is also a hard one, especially for a proud man who wants to be universally popular. For there is no disguising the fact that a negotiated truce can be had only by settling for a good deal less than a victory, and this means that the President must expect to be denounced by many, and to have his pride wounded. It takes great political strength and a high degree of moral courage for the head of a state to make the kind of peace which may now be possible in the Vietnamese mess. General Eisenhower, the victorious commander of the Allied armies, was able to make a settlement in Korea which President Truman would never have dared to make. General Eisenhower had at that time an invulnerable prestige.

An even more pertinent analogy is to be found in the way General de Gaulle liquidated the messy war in Algeria. The President would do well to study and ponder what happened, how General de Gaulle extricated France from a war which she had not lost but could not win, how he negotiated with his adversaries in the field, the Algerian counterpart of the Vietcong, and made with them a "peace of the brave," how he outwitted and defied the extremists at the risk of his life—and how, having devoted himself unflinchingly to the true interest of France, which was peace with Algeria, he won the gratitude and esteem of his countrymen, including almost all of those who voted against him in the recent election.

PAYING THE PRICE

The hard decision the President has to make is whether he can accept the political and psychological risks of dealing with Vietnam as General Eisenhower dealt with Korea and as General de Gaulle dealt with north Africa. For President Johnson will have to pay a heavy price for the historical mistake of involving the United States in a land war against Asians in Asia. The alternative to paying a price for peace is to pay the enormous price of a great war which threatens to expand into a world war.

The President has made it quite clear that he realizes the hard choice which is before him. Naturally enough, he is looking for some easier way out of his dilemma. If only he could find one. But by his decisions in 1964, he rejected the warning by men in a position to know that there was not much time left to negotiate an arrangement. He has come very near to locking and bolting the door. He has raised the stakes so high that easy solutions are most improbable and only the hard choices remain.

House of Representatives

TUESDAY, JANUARY 18, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., used this verse of Scripture: *Isaiah 60: 12: For the nation and kingdom that will not serve Thee shall perish.*

Almighty God, as we again invoke Thy blessing, grant that our faith may be increased, our hope renewed, and our wills strengthened toward goodness and righteousness.

We know that Thou art waiting to stir our dull hearts and to move us in patient obedience to what Thou dost command.

Help us to hasten the dawning of the day when trouble and tragedy shall be overcome and transformed into beauty and truth and our human life shall be better than it is.

May the cynicism of our time and the clouds of bitterness, which it casts over the earth, be dispelled.

Inspire us to believe that the liberty and brotherhood we seek and we strive for have a spiritual basis.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

LETTERS FOR VIETNAM PEACE

(Mr. BROWN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, during the month of December 1965, I received some 526 letters from all over the Nation urging me to join with the President and with Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY in a strong, continuing effort to seek negotiations for peace in Vietnam.

Most of the letters requested an extension of the moratorium on the bombing of North Vietnam until such time as negotiations have actually begun—and, then, for an end to all warfare. Many of the letters I received were copies of those sent to the President. Some of the messages were on Christmas cards—sent before the holidays—asking for a Christmas cease-fire.

These messages are almost all couched in a language of moderation and express praise of the President's efforts for a peaceful settlement. Many of them are quite long and show the results of a great deal of time and thoughtfulness that went into well-planned suggestions.

I am impressed, Mr. Speaker, with the general tone of temperance and constructiveness embodied in this correspondence, and I am further impressed with the deep concern of many of our citizens for human beings on the other side of the world in Vietnam. I am also personally grateful for the continuing efforts being made by President Johnson to effect a settlement of hostilities in southeastern Asia.

CREATION OF A NUCLEAR NAVY

(Mr. MORRIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include an address by the Honorable CHET HOLIFIELD and a telegram from the President.)

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, on January 17, it was my privilege to be present at the keel-laying ceremony of our newest attack submarine, the U.S.S. *Narwhal*. This date also marked the 11th anniversary of the sailing of the world's first nuclear submarine, the U.S.S. *Nautilus*.

On this occasion, my distinguished colleague, CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, was the principal speaker. It is with a great deal of pleasure that I rise to place in the RECORD the remarks made by Congressman HOLIFIELD, and have also requested permission to place in the RECORD a telegram from President Johnson—a former member of the Joint Committee—which was sent to Congressman HOLIFIELD praising the creation of a nuclear navy as an outstanding achievement.

I believe our country owes a debt of gratitude to the Congress and particularly to the Joint Committee for the consistent support the legislative branch gave to the then Capt. H. G. Rickover in his fight to keep our Navy second to none. That fight is still going on and I would like to associate myself with the remarks made by CHET HOLIFIELD yesterday—particularly when he said:

I hope the day will soon come when the executive branch will accept the recommendation of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy "that the United States adopt a policy of using nuclear propulsion in all future major surface warships," thus forging another link in the necessary chain from sail to coal, from coal to oil, and from oil to nuclear power. In future years, may it not be said of our Nation's leaders that they valued dollars more highly than the lives of our fighting men and our national security itself.

I commend this speech to all of us as an example of foresightedness and dedication to national security. The Congress must continue the fight for a nuclear-powered Navy.

The material referred to follows:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN CHET HOLIFIELD AT KEEL LAYING CEREMONY FOR U.S.S. "NARWHAL," SSN671, GROTON, CONN., JANUARY 17, 1966

Eleven years ago today the world's first nuclear powered ship, the attack submarine U.S.S. *Nautilus*, SSN671, sent her famous message, "Underway on nuclear power." Today we are here to lay the keel of our newest nuclear attack submarine, the U.S.S. *Narwhal*, SSN671. This submarine is designed to be technically superior in military effectiveness to all previous attack submarines.

I especially want to congratulate the employees and management of Electric Boat for the prominent part they have played in our Nation's attainment of a position of pre-eminence in the nuclear submarine field. Here the first one—the *Nautilus*—was laid down. The first Polaris submarine was also built in your yard in addition to the first ship of a number of new classes of nuclear submarines which have or are joining our nuclear fleet. Another major first assigned to Electric Boat is the design and construction of the first nuclear propelled oceanographic research submarine, called NR-1, which we look to as the vanguard of our advance into inner space. The primary mission of the NR-1 vehicle is to determine as quickly as possible the feasibility of nuclear propulsion for this application. Because of the vastly increased endurance made possible by nuclear power, the capability of NR-1 will be an order of magnitude greater than any other developed or planned to date.

Including the *Nautilus*, Congress has authorized 99 nuclear submarines. So you can see we have been proceeding with a vigorous development and construction program for nuclear-powered submarines. But it should be remembered that the necessary support for the nuclear submarine program had to be won by hard effort. The history of the early years of the naval nuclear propulsion program was marked by a reluctance within the Defense Department to use nuclear power for the propulsion of submarines.

Now that we have 56 nuclear submarines at sea;

Now that our Polaris-armed nuclear submarines stand their watchful guard hidden under the oceans of the world;

Now that our attack nuclear submarines provide our Navy with an indispensable anti-submarine warfare capability;

Now that our nuclear-powered surface warships *Enterprise* and *Bainbridge* have been committed to combat in Vietnam—few remember that it was the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that arranged to buy the nuclear power plants for our first two nuclear submarines, the *Nautilus* and *Seawolf*, with Atomic Energy Commission funds, because the then Capt. H. G. Rickover was not able to get the necessary support in the Department of Defense for his project in the early 1950's.

Let us beware that history does not repeat itself.

We must be alert to assure that the reluctance of the Department of Defense to invest in surface warships does not let our Navy lapse into obsolescence. We must build modern warships for our future Navy—warships with the proven advantages of nuclear propulsion.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

January 18, 1966

Those of you who were here on that day in 1952 when President Harry S. Truman laid the keel of the *Nautilus* will recall his warning, and I quote:

"All national security programs are expensive and we might as well face up to it."

"I think the efforts that are being made to sell the American people of the idea that there is some cutrate bargain-counter route to national security are very dangerous. The people of this country have faith and courage and patriotism enough to do what is required for our national survival. They are willing to do what is necessary even though the way may be long and hard."

"The difficulty is that the American people are getting all kinds of foolish advice from persons who ought to know better."

"We may have to live in a half-peace, half-war condition for a long time to come. We must lay our plans accordingly. If we are to maintain peace, we must be prepared to defeat aggression. And we must be prepared to make the long-term investment in national security that this requires."

I believe in getting a dollar's worth of value for every defense dollar we spend, but let us not be beguiled into believing that there is a new cutrate, bargain-counter route to national secur'v. The factors of military effectiveness in the protection of our Nation's security must always be dominant over the factors of cost. In southeast Asia today the United States is once again faced with the bitter reality that what counts in war is military effectiveness—not cost effectiveness.

Cost effectiveness studies have been cited by the Defense Department to support the contention that the advantage of nuclear propulsion are not particularly significant for surface warships. These studies, however, contain a fundamental weakness that makes their conclusions wrong—they are based on false assumptions and do not place proper emphasis on military effectiveness. These cost-effectiveness studies were based on—

The assumption that tankers and oilers needed to supply propulsion fuel for oil-fired warships will operate unhampered by the enemy and suffer no losses;

The assumption that the fuel oil needed to run our conventional surface warships will be readily available wherever and whenever needed; and

The assumption that no cost factor need be included in their studies for losses—or protection of our propulsion fuel oil supply lines.

These are dangerous assumptions to use in evaluating the cost and effectiveness of weapons of war. Most of you remember, as I do, when the beaches along our Atlantic coast were soaked with oil from sunken tankers and our ability to provide fuel for our fighting forces was seriously threatened. What price would Americans be willing to pay for nuclear powered warships under circumstances like those?

Congress has been told by the Department of Defense that the choice we face is between a given number of conventional ships and a smaller number of nuclear ships for the same total cost. In other words, to improve a weapon system, we are told that we must reduce the number of weapons to p' for it. We in Congress do not accept this cutrate bargain-counter reasoning. I might add that the President in his message to the Congress last Wednesday did not espouse such reasoning when he said:

"We will give our fighting men what they must have: Every gun and every dollar, and every decision—whatever the cost or whatever the challenge."

Our potential enemies may not use the same cost effectiveness criteria and thus may oppose us with the best weapons tech-

nology can provide them. This could create an intolerable peril to our national security.

Chairman L. MENDELL RIVERS, of the House Armed Services Committee, recently said, and I quote:

"I am convinced, and I think it is fair to say that the Congress as a body is convinced, that the Navy of the future must be nuclear powered. There is no reason why our future aircraft carriers, cruisers, frigates, and destroyers cannot be powered by nuclear energy. It is clear that continuing to build conventionally powered warships will, in the long run, be economically wasteful; it would be following a policy of built-in obsolescence."

I fully agree with this statement of my distinguished colleague from South Carolina. It is time to take advantage of one of the few areas in technology where we are significantly ahead of our antagonists. We should proceed with a vigorous program to build nuclear powered warships that can give the United States an unprecedented naval force to maintain the freedom of the seas and improve our ability to survive the half-peace, half-war condition as President Truman so aptly called it.

I have been privileged to be a member of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy since its inception 20 years ago and have the honor of being its current Chairman. The Joint Committee is charged, by law, with the responsibility for making continuing studies of problems relating to the development, use, and control of atomic energy. The Committee has historically played a creative role in fulfilling the declared statutory policy of the United States that the development, use, and control of atomic energy shall be directed so as to make the "maximum contribution to the common defense and security."

The Joint Committee, from its inception, has been interested in and vigorously supported research and development in the field of naval nuclear propulsion: first, for submarines and then for surface warships.

Two years ago, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy made an exhaustive study of the subject of nuclear propulsion of surface warships. We concluded that "each new warship the United States decides to build for our first-line naval striking force should be the best that our technology will allow and should therefore have nuclear propulsion, even if a somewhat higher cost is incurred to pay for the increase in military capability."

We printed for the public record a report of these hearings in December 1963. In releasing this report, Chairman JOHN O. PASTORE, the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, said, and I quote:

"The Joint Committee believes that cost cutting is important but it must eliminate the fat and not cut to the marrow."

"It is my earnest hope that we will never again be forced to go to war, but if we do, I want our equipment to be second to none."

Nuclear propulsion has the fundamental advantage of permitting our warships to go anywhere in the world, to deliver their combat load and to return—all without logistic support.

Oil-fired warships must be refueled every few days. This requires a vulnerable worldwide distribution system to provide fuel oil for conventional ships.

As the number of foreign nuclear submarines increases and as the air striking capabilities of our potential enemies increase, the difficulty of providing this logistic support will surely increase. The basic reason for developing nuclear power for surface warships is to reduce this logistic support—support which will be most difficult, if not impossible under some circumstances, to provide in wartime. Nuclear propulsion in combat ships will free the striking forces of

our Navy from the obvious restrictions of reliance on a worldwide propulsion fuel distribution system.

We must plan for times of crisis. It is precisely in such situations that the superior mobility, maneuverability, and reliability of nuclear warships will give the United States an unequalled naval striking force.

In the 4 years, fiscal years 1960 through 1963, subsequent to authorization of the three nuclear powered surface ships now in the fleet, the aircraft carrier *Enterprise*, the cruiser *Long Beach*, and the frigate *Bainbridge*, the Department of Defense obtained authorization for 2 new aircraft carriers and 10 new frigates, all of which should have been nuclear powered. If these 12 ships had been provided nuclear propulsion, we would now have in being or under construction three nuclear powered carrier task forces for our Navy instead of the one we have. However, of these 12 ships, only one, the frigate *Truxtun* to be completed this year will have nuclear power.

And the *Truxtun* will be nuclear powered only because of the initiative taken by the Congress 5 years ago to authorize and appropriate the extra funds to change the U.S.S. *Truxtun* from an oil-fired frigate to be our fourth nuclear powered surface warship.

But in the past 3 years, the Department of Defense has not requested authorization for any surface warship of destroyer size or larger—nuclear or conventional. The surface Navy is aging rapidly and is even now faced with widespread obsolescence. In the late 1950's and early 1960's there was a vigorous warship construction program and the introduction of nuclear propulsion in surface warships. However, this has been followed by a long period with no surface warship construction of any kind. It is clear that this cannot go on much longer without the capability of the U.S. Navy sinking far below the needs of our national security.

It was Congress who took the lead in forcing the shift to nuclear power in submarines. It was Congress who took the lead in developing nuclear propulsion for surface warships. It was Congress who strongly supported the building of the three nuclear surface warships now in the fleet which have so ably demonstrated to the world the obvious capabilities of nuclear propulsion in warships.

Congress again took the initiative last year by authorizing construction of the fifth nuclear-powered surface warship—a guided-missile frigate. This ship was added to the Defense Department authorization even though the Secretary of Defense had overruled a Navy proposal to build it.

The members of our Committee were pleased to see the strong endorsements for building more nuclear-powered surface warships, and specifically the new nuclear frigate, given by the House and Senate Armed Services and Appropriations Committees. It is clear from the legislative history of this particular ship that it is the will of Congress that the long-leadtime items needed for construction of the nuclear frigate be procured in this fiscal year and that funds needed for its completion be included in the fiscal year 1967 appropriation.

However, to date there have been no indications that the Department of Defense intends to pay any attention whatsoever to this clear expression of the will of Congress. This, of course, will force us to consider what additional steps can be taken to insure that the Congress is not thwarted in its efforts to carry out its constitutional responsibility to the American People: "To provide and maintain a Navy." All thinking Americans know that the checks and balances in our form of government are intended to prevent the arbitrary exercise of power by anyone of the three branches of Government.

Appendix

Four Chaplains Memorial Sunday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 18, 1966

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a communication of the director of public relations of the department of Maine of the American Legion be placed in the RECORD because of its timely reminder of the Four Chaplains Memorial Sunday on February 6, 1966.

There being no objection, the communication was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ORRINGTON, MAINE,
January 2, 1966.

FOUR CHAPLAINS MEMORIAL SUNDAY

MY FELLOW AMERICANS: On Sunday, February 6, 1966, the Department of Maine, American Legion, will lead the statewide observance of the Four Chaplains Memorial Sunday. We urge all Legion and auxiliary groups and the churches of Maine to join with us in this observance.

The heroic story of the four chaplains—George L. Fox, Methodist; Alexander D. Goode, Jewish; Johnny P. Washington, Catholic; and Clark V. Poling, Reformed Church, is a legend in our time. Four men of God who gave their lives to save others on the sinking trooper USS *Dorchester* in the North Atlantic on that icy February morning during World War II. The ship, torpedoed by the enemy, was sinking when the four chaplains removed their lifejackets, gave them to others, and then stood together on the sinking ship praying for their shipmates.

We urge you to contact all churches in your area requesting special observance during the Four Chaplains Memorial Sunday. Contact the clubs and organizations of your community and give leadership to a special effort to promote the observance of Four Chaplains Memorial Sunday.

Legion post commanders and chaplains assisted by public relations officers should also contact local radio and television stations seeking to stimulate interest in this observance.

All posts, county and district organizations are requested to hold a special Four Chaplains Memorial program during the month of February.

In a time of crisis for our Nation there is a message of strength in the story of the four chaplains. There is the courage of men of God and the living memorial of the sacrifices of all chaplains in the service of our Nation.

Maine and the Nation need to be reminded of the religious heritage and the courage and devotion of all people of good faith. We can tell this story by our observance of Four Chaplains Memorial Sunday and by the retelling of the story of the four men of God—Americans all—serving God and country.

Let Sunday, February 6, 1966, be a banner

day in the history of the Maine American Legion. Let it be a day of rededication to the principles of "for God and country." Let the message of the four chaplains be told by all American Legion groups in Maine.

Many thanks,

DANIEL E. LAMBERT,
Director of Public Relations, the
American Legion.

Approved: Sidney H. Schwartz, Department Commander, the American Legion.

Subsidies by Any Other Name Are Still Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1966

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, at the present time the maritime situation is receiving widespread attention because of the maritime task force report recently released, the shortage of ships to carry supplies to Vietnam, and the shortage of licensed officers to man the ships.

The matter of subsidies for shipbuilding and ship operations is a favorite subject for criticism. In this connection, I believe several recent articles in the Baltimore Sun by Mrs. Helen Delich Bentley, the paper's very able maritime editor, will be extremely helpful in shedding some light on this matter and wish to insert them in the Appendix:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Nov. 1, 1965]

WATERFRONT SIDELIGHTS

(By Helen Delich Bentley, maritime editor of the Sun)

NEW YORK, October 31.—A fellow maritime newspaper editor the other day asked whether we had read "This Is Marad," a booklet published earlier this year by the Maritime Administration regarding its operations.

We replied affirmatively and thought nothing more about it. But our colleague pursued the matter with the comment, "Boy, you'd never think that the same person who put that out would put out the task force report or make all of the speeches he is making now."

His reference was to Nicholas Johnson, the Maritime Administrator, whose photograph appears on the page containing the foreword to "This Is Marad."

TASK FORCE REPORT

The 31-year-old Administrator also is often referred to as the one whose thinking produced most of the recently issued controversial recommendations of the interagency maritime task force as to how the American merchant marine should be reconstructed and operated in the future.

The last two paragraphs of the foreword read:

"In good times and in bad, in peace and in war, the United States needs merchant ships

to carry its trade, to contribute to its economy, to protect its worldwide interests. It is our job at the Maritime Administration to see that the American people have that kind of merchant marine; but this responsibility can be adequately discharged only if the American people understand the role of the merchant marine in our national life.

"I hope this booklet will help to promote such understanding."

"FOR WAR AND PEACE"

Under this title "For War and Peace," it states:

"Merchant ships perform a dual service. In peacetime they carry on the trade between nations; in war or national emergencies they serve either as an integral part or as an adjunct to the Armed Forces, carrying military goods and personnel or materials essential to war production or to sustain the civilian population.

"In peacetime American merchant ships must compete in the open market against foreign shipping for the world's trade; in wartime they usually work directly for the Government. To this dual role can be attributed the concern of the Nation for the adequacy of the merchant fleet."

"DEMONSTRATED MANY TIMES"

Under the heading of national security, the booklet says:

"Since the founding of our Nation, the importance of a strong American merchant marine has been forcibly demonstrated many times. * * * As in the preceding centuries, the last 65 years have brought many occasions when the security of the Nation was dependent in large measure on the availability of a strong and active U.S. merchant marine."

It cites instances from World War I and World War II when this country had to provide the free world with most of its merchant ships, from Korea, the Suez Canal, and Lebanon.

"IN EVENT OF LIMITED WAR"

And then it adds, "Although war strategy plans have changed with the introduction of new weapons, present Department of Defense plans still call for the use of substantial numbers of merchant ships for purely military purposes in the event of a limited war."

The last paragraph under that heading states:

"There are separate but related needs for sustaining America's defense and civilian economies in time of war. The existence of a substantial, fast modern merchant fleet under the American flag is an essential element in any plan to meet these vital needs."

"To deter aggression in threatened areas throughout the world, we have positioned men and equipment in many lands. In 1963, 1,340,000 tons of cargo to supply these forces were carried by the U.S.-subsidized lines alone."

Under the heading "Economic Strength," "This Is Marad" says:

"Less dramatic but fully important today is the contribution which a U.S. merchant fleet makes to the economic welfare of the country by assuring uninterrupted movement of the agricultural, manufactured and raw materials in the foreign commerce which is necessary to the continued and ever-increasing prosperity of the country."

"LARGEST TRADING NATION"

"The United States is the world's largest trading Nation, accounting for 15 percent of all world trade. About 99 percent of this trade moves by sea.

"We depend upon a large variety of imported foods, raw materials and other products to maintain our high standard of living, and to supply necessary elements of many of the manufactured exports which we in turn ship to other nations.

"As American oceanborne foreign commerce increases during the next 20 years from its present level of about \$30 billion to a projected level of nearly \$60 billion, it is essential that we maintain effective control over the rates and services of the shipping lines which will carry our trade.

"DOMESTIC BENEFITS"

"Finally, there are substantial domestic economic benefits from the merchant marine. The maritime industry, including the merchant portion of the shipbuilding industry, generates about \$1.5 billion in gross national product and pays about \$75 million in Federal and local taxes. In addition, the 100,000 maritime employees pay about \$80 million in personal income taxes.

"The provision of shipping services by U.S.-flag ships conserves about \$800 million of our dollar exchange each year, thus aiding our balance-of-payments position.

"It has been demonstrated that we cannot depend upon other countries to supply at all times the ships needed for the defense and trade of the United States.

"SHIPS AND SHIPBUILDING"

"We must, therefore, maintain enough ships, shipbuilding capacity, experienced shipping companies, and skilled workmen and seamen of our own to provide a U.S. merchant marine adequate to the demands of both war and peace."

The above quotations—all from a booklet published earlier this year by the Maritime Administration—reflect the thinking of most people about the American merchant marine. As we noted earlier, these were made over the signature of the Administrator.

The reason the President's Maritime Advisory Committee took such a strong stand against the task force report was its apparent initial aim—of providing a merchant marine only adequate to take care of one initial emergency needs of this Nation.

The justification given in the task force report is that that proposal will give the Nation more ships than if the fleet continues on its present course.

Neither of these two courses is the answer to the problem. The answer should be a merchant marine strong and large enough to take care of this country's military and commercial needs.

The situation right now is strong evidence that, despite the large numbers of ships in the reserve fleet, there is question whether the merchant fleet is adequate to do both even though Uncle Sam is involved in only a "brush fire" in southeast Asia.

MSTS DECLARES NEED

The Military Sea Transportation Service let it be known last week that more ships are needed on this run and has called all the shipowners in for a conference Tuesday.

Even before this, MSTS has had to use foreign-flag ships to supplement the American vessels to Vietnam. According to an affidavit submitted by Vice Adm. Glynn E. Donaho, MSTS commander, 14 foreign ships were chartered between June 10 and September 8.

Since that time, at least two foreign ships have been chartered—with Maritime Administration approval—to supplement the commercial operations of subsidized steamship lines on essential trade routes because they had so many bottoms serving Vietnam.

MORE CHARTERS LIKELY

And there have been indications that more foreign vessels may be chartered for this purpose—provided foreign ones can be obtained in view of the worldwide demand for moving military supplies to southeast Asia, moving Canadian wheat to Russia and Red China, as well as moving the regular everyday cargoes.

Certainly this would indicate that the U.S. active fleet at this time is not adequate to sustain America's defense and civilian economies in time of peace, let alone war—the administration keeps emphasizing the Vietnam situation is not a war, but a brush fire and everything is being handled on a business-as-usual basis.

CONDITION OF RESERVE FLEET

There appears to be considerable speculation about the condition of the reserve fleet, whether the remaining vessels are in condition to be broken out or whether the costs will justify breaking them out.

An independent ship surveyor who has visited most of the reserve fleets notes that the Liberty ships which are being sold for scrap are in better condition than many of the Victory type being reactivated.

He explained that the Liberty is a simple ship and there is not too much electrical and electronic work aboard "to go bad," which means a minimum expense for reactivation. This is not true of the Victories and C-2's.

WAR MIGHT ABSORB COST

If ships are as sorely needed as MSTS would indicate, it seems the cost of breaking them out would be meaningless, would just be one of the items absorbed in the expenditure of the "brush fire" in Vietnam.

Despite all the pronouncements out of Washington that war strategy plans have changed, only last week the Navy Department said 98 percent of the supplies moving to Vietnam are going by sea.

This in itself should make some of the detractors of the merchant marine take notice.

BOOKLET AND REPORT

How can one justify the booklet's words under the heading of "Economic Strength" and then turn around and say we can depend on foreign ships for these cargoes cited?

That section emphasizes that merchant shipbuilding along with the rest of the maritime industry generates about \$1.5 billion in the gross national product, and yet the task force is calling for shipbuilding in foreign yards hereafter.

The booklet also states that the Federal Government receives at least \$130 million in taxes from the maritime industry and that American-flag ships conserve about \$800 million of this country's dollar exchange, thus contributing to the balance of payments.

FIGURES SEEM STILL VALID

Do these figures no longer mean anything? Is it no longer important to this country to be able to control rates?

"This is Marad" states that the high standard of living in the United States—"of which we are most proud"—makes it difficult to provide and maintain a merchant fleet competing in international trade with other nations—and, therefore, Government assistance has been made available to offset these cost differentials.

NOW CRITICAL OF HIGHER COSTS

And yet the tone of the maritime administrator in recent statements has been critical of the higher costs in the United States and anxious for the United States to have "truly competitive shipbuilding and shipping industries."

Maybe the independent unnamed economists who have persuaded Johnson that it would be better to build in foreign yards

and lean toward foreign countries for this form of transportation could explain it all better.

My colleague and I are still confused.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Dec. 13, 1965]

AROUND THE WATERFRONT: JOHNSON NOW ELABORATE IN TASK FORCE ADVOCACY
(By Helen Delich Bentley, maritime editor of the Sun)

SAN FRANCISCO, December 12.—Nicholas Johnson, Maritime Administrator, has been arguing for the position of the controversial task force report.

Johnson was one of four high Government officials who addressed the Maritime Trades Department of the AFL-CIO during its 3-day biennial convention here.

In terms of rank, the four could be listed as follows:

John H. Henning, Under Secretary of Labor.

Alan S. Boyd, Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation.

George H. Hearn, one of five Commissioners on the Federal Maritime Commission.

Nicholas Johnson, Maritime Administrator.

OTHERS UNACCOMPANIED

Henning made this trip unaccompanied by any member of his staff and held no press conference.

Boyd likewise traveled without any aids and held no press conference although he had a frank and open discussion with the press after his speech. Although Boyd is chairman of the task force, he pulled no behind-the-scenes punches.

Hearn also traveled alone without any aids and held no press conference.

Nicholas Johnson had two men make the trip from Washington with him, although he has been loudly stressing Government economy.

TWO JOHNSON AIDS

One of those with Johnson, although not on the same plane, was Ivan Scott, who is being characterized as the "personal public relations" man for Johnson.

Scott was employed as of December 1 and his first assignment was that of traveling to the west coast to set up press conferences in each of the four areas visited by the Maritime Administrator. There already is a press information center in the Maritime Adminstration.

The other was George R. Griffiths, sometimes described as the Maritime Administration's liaison man with the military Sea Transportation Service and other times as a special assistant to Johnson, of which there are increasing numbers.

PRESS CONFERENCE OBJECTIONS

At the press conference in San Francisco—the first of the four and the only one attended by this reporter—it was difficult to obtain direct answers from Johnson about the task force recommendations as differing from those of the President's Maritime Advisory Committee.

Johnson also had several members from the local staff of the Maritime Administration accompanying him a good part of the time he was in San Francisco, Portland, Seattle, and Los Angeles.

This array undoubtedly was impressive to some persons.

SOME DISSENTING OWNERS

For example, when he tried to impress upon the press that the Advisory Committee recommendations were not accepted by three committee members, he failed to add, until questioned, that two of the objectors were major foreign-flag shipowners.

Johnson failed to say that the third, a banker, had at first, refused to join the com-

January 18, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

mittee because he feared a conflict of interest in that his bank had foreign-flag customers. Furthermore, this member has attended almost no meetings, including the last one.

Paul Hall, president of the maritime trades department, called Johnson "stupid," but was glad that he was because he had openly shown how the Government was going to sabotage the American merchant marine.

"GOING TO DO TO US"

Preceding maritime administrators had taken steps to undercut the merchant fleet, Hall said, "but never before one stood up and said publicly what they are going to do to us."

Hall also in public accused Johnson of "deliberate misuse of statistics" and of juggling figures "to justify this lie" of how much the subsidy to individual seamen is in comparison with that to farmers.

Hall explained that when the Maritime Administration calculated how much the operating subsidy payments to seamen amounted to, it divided only the number of men actually going to sea aboard the subsidized ships into the amount of the subsidy rather than taking into consideration the persons backing up that operation on shore, such as the office staffs and shipyard workers.

MORE RECKONED FARMERS

On the other hand, to lessen the agriculture amount, the Seafarers' official said, the Maritime Administration adds up every family member on any 10-acre plot that produced \$50 worth in a year, plus 1.5 million retired farmers, several million farmers who receive no subsidy, to those who are subsidized and actually earn their pay at farming.

Thus, the farm figure comes out to about \$1,100 per person, while the seaman subsidy quoted by Johnson is \$7,500 to \$12,000 a man.

If the shipping industry was given the same broad general description as that of agriculture, Hall asserted the figures per person would be identical because shipping would then be \$1,100 per person.

"SMALL-MINDED PEOPLE"

"These small-minded people are killing off this industry," Hall declared.

The description of a sneaking stumping tour applied to Johnson's trip did not come from labor, but from one of the country's outstanding management spokesmen—Paul St. Sure, chairman of the Pacific Maritime Association and a member of the President's Maritime Advisory Committee.

Other persons here feel Johnson is out to prove that he has been able to hold down the subsidy outlay to merchant shipping.

CALLS RESEARCH BETTER DRAW

St. Sure related that Johnson told shipping executives here that although he could do nothing about getting more subsidy to build more than 15 to 17 ships a year in American yards, he could get \$2 billion for a research and development program.

American shipyards have contended right along that if they could get any assurance of a regular shipbuilding program—the 15 to 17 ships a year mean Government assistance of about \$100 million—they would be able to do more toward modernizing their facilities to reduce costs further.

This might be as good a place as any to put some of those research and development billions.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Dec. 20, 1965]

AROUND THE WATERFRONTS LABOR GAINS LIGHT ON SHIPPING

(By Helen Delich Bentley, maritime editor of the Sun)

SAN FRANCISCO, December 19.—The maritime unions performed a monumental job toward getting the story of the maritime

industry moved "inland" when they succeeded in getting it placed on the congressional checklist of the AFL-CIO Committee on Political Education.

That action at the recent AFL-CIO convention is described as a major coup by the leaders of the seamen's unions because hereafter it will mean that 12 million members of the AFL-CIO and their families will be confronted with the fact that there is a maritime industry in the United States and that apparently it is important to all organized labor—which means it must be considered when candidates are indorsed.

MANAGEMENT'S CHANCE TO ADD

Now it will be interesting to see what management does to match this performance or to uphold its "share" of putting the maritime industry across to the general public.

Never has the American shipping industry had the opportunity it now has nor is it likely to have it again if it flubs this time as it has done many times in the past.

The stage was set by Nicholas Johnson, the youthful Maritime Administrator, in a speech last February 9 when he first said publicly that, as far as he was concerned, part of the industry was to be scuttled and the rest of it was to be revamped.

A climax was reached October 7 when the contents of the Interagency maritime task force report were formally made public and found to be quite similar to the February 9 curtain raiser.

Meanwhile, fortunately, functioning in another theater was a three-part cast—composed of public, labor and management members—known as the President's Maritime Advisory Committee with the assignment of developing a long-range program to improve the U.S. merchant marine.

They did not like the contents of the task force presentation and drew up their own.

CONTRASTS SEE SAME GOAL

Each program now is being performed with a different view in mind, because the basic lines are so different—such as building abroad, eliminating cargo preference and American-flag passenger ships.

However, both claim to have the same goal—that of improving the merchant marine.

Johnson, with an entourage of aids and press conferences wherever he goes, has been conducting a tour to promote his curtain-raiser thoughts.

Not following precedent, labor and management have engaged the same stage—the National Shipping Conference—and the same program as their theme to offset the task force.

BOYD OFFERS OLIVE BRANCH

Alan S. Boyd, the chairman of the task force and Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, extended an olive branch here ten days ago and said, "Let's stop shooting each other and reach a common ground."

Reportedly, the Defense Department has employed a "whiz kid" engineering outfit to put the two reports side by side, compare them and come out with a middle-of-the-road program. There is confirmation of this.

And then, of course, there is the comparative analysis of the two which the task force team made and which was not supposed to be made public—as was determined by the Advisory Committee and John T. Connor, Secretary of Commerce. However, Johnson released most of its contents in his first speech of his recent campaign.

JOHNSON ROUSES INDUSTRY

If Johnson has done nothing else, he has shocked most of the industry—labor and management—into realization that something has to be done and done soon if the maritime industry of the United States, first, is to be saved and, second, is to expand.

His statements described by his opponents as inaccuracies and half-truths have helped toward the alert.

As a result of all this, there is more of a furor in the Nation over the merchant marine than perhaps at any time since 1936 when the act was passed.

VIETNAM CALLS ATTENTION

With the Vietnam situation becoming more critical and ships playing a large role there, shipping once again has the value of its contribution to defense being portrayed daily before the Nation.

Thus the stage has been set so that the industry has an opportunity such as it has not had for three decades.

With knowledge of all this background, it was startling to hear that the west coast president of a subsidized steamship company remarked here Friday that, since his company's ships were sailing chock-a-block full, he could not see any reason why his company should contribute money toward any type of an advertising or promotion campaign now.

It was particularly disheartening because there had been a bit of a reason to believe this man's eyes had been opened earlier in the week to the fact that the industry's continued negligence of promotion, of better understanding, has contributed to its rather queasy position today.

Such narrow points of view are exactly what has been wrong with the American maritime industry for scores of years and apparently is going to remain if his attitude is an indication.

When business has been at a peak, the American shipping industry has shrugged its shoulders and said it was pointless to put on a program of any kind because there was no need for it—business was good.

MONEY LAGS WITH BUSINESS

When business has slacked off and rides along at a low ebb with bludgeoning from every side, the industry declares it does not have the money then to do anything to offset it.

The shipowners' and shipyards' inconsistency has helped box them into their present undesirable position and sometimes it is difficult to sympathize with them.

It would not be surprising if other top industry officials feel somewhat like the west coast president.

UNION PROPAGANDA ARM

As was noted, the labor unions have made a major contribution toward getting the word into Dubuque, Iowa; Denver, St. Louis, and other places for next year's congressional election and thereafter. From now on there will be a space for each Congressman's name to show whether he voted the right way on maritime legislation.

The AFL-CIO Committee on Political Education is powerful in swinging votes, organized labor claims, and is getting more so every year now that it has the full support of the AFL-CIO behind it.

For a while the committee floundered because the top echelon of the AFL-CIO was not supporting it.

But it kept plugging along until finally the executive council blessed it. The committee functions on a \$1-a-year contribution from each member of a union—or at least the dollar per member is its goal.

All of that is a real achievement, but there is considerable work to be done between now and the congressional elections to put over a merchant marine program to the Nation—to let them know why they need a fleet adequate both for defense and commercial purposes. No more time should be wasted while the industry sits around and wonders, What do we do now?

NEED TO AID REPUTATION

Some definite strides toward a real improvement in public image must be made immediately—and that can only be done through a well-financed public relations program.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

January 18, 1966

And while they are thinking along these lines, both management and labor should knock their heads together and be willing to improve labor relations in the industry so that part of the way the public thinks of them will recover.

There is no doubt that the decrepit labor relations in the maritime industry—and both sides are at fault—has been a major assist to Johnson in selling his negative views and criticisms of the industry.

LEADERS ON BOTH SIDES

The individual leaders on both sides of the bargaining table should look in the mirror and ask what is more important: personal aggrandizement or the overall healthy industry.

Yes, the stage has been set. The lines are partially written. The cast is available. Everything affirmative is there for the industry. But only if the members of the cast trust each other and cooperate with each other—management within management, labor within labor, as well as labor and management and public parties—and only if the lines are properly developed can a four-star performance be the result. Such a performance not only would be for the industry, but for the Nation as a whole.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Dec. 26, 1965]

U.S. SUBSIDY PLANS COVER MANY AREAS—MERCHANT MARINE NOT ALONE IN FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

(By Helen Delich Bentley, maritime editor of the Sun)

SAN FRANCISCO, Dec. 23.—The merchant marine has been singled out for tremendous criticism about its subsidy in recent years, while the only other Government-assisted program referred to constantly is the farm subsidy.

However, a recently published report prepared for the Joint Economic Committee of Congress reveals nine pages of listings of various grants made annually by Uncle Sam to all elements of the Nation's business and economic life.

The introduction to chapter II, entitled "Scope of Studies," begins, "A better understanding and appreciation of the sweeping, amorphous character of subsidy programs may be gained by a mere listing of the various Federal programs, past and present, which, by one criterion or another, might be considered to partake of or involve an element of subsidy regardless of original intent of any particular program."

LISTED AS GRANTS

Under the heading of "Grants to business firms and corporations to carry out specific objectives," it lists the following:

Shipbuilding differential subsidy—Maritime Administration; shipbuilding subsidy for fishing vessels—Interior Department; ship-operating differential subsidy; subsidies to wartime producers of various raw materials and consumer items to stimulate production without violating price ceilings; land grants and cash contributions for railroad construction; Government subscriptions to railroad securities; subsidies for carrying mail—ship and civil air carriers; partial financing of plants to generate electricity from atomic fuels.

In the chapter on transportation subsidies, it discusses the assistance that has been given to the airlines since 1925 and noted that today the subsidy payouts in air transportation are devoted to the 14 local service carriers and carriers in Alaska and Hawaii. These amount to about \$85 million a year.

"Aside from these direct subsidies, air carriers have also benefited from such varied governmental assistance as airport and airway facilities, other navigation aids, aeronautical research and development conducted under governmental auspices, the

safety regulations of the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the sale of surplus aircraft, available to both new and existing companies engaged in civil transport," the report said.

WIDELY DEBATED

On the matter of motor carriers, it noted that whether the extensive expenditures on highway and street improvement constituted a direct subsidy to the motor carrier industry has been widely debated.

Representatives of the motor carrier industry have contended that through registration fees, gasoline taxes, and other charges which have gone into the construction of public roads, the industry has met all the costs properly attributable to it. This is denied by railroad spokesmen."

And in regard to railroads, the report concluded that the total and net subsidies to railroads by Federal and State government are subject to some uncertainty.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Jan. 10, 1966]

AROUND THE WATERFRONT: CONGRESS HAS ITS CHANCE FOR MAJOR MARITIME CURES

(By Helen Delich Bentley, maritime editor of the Sun)

WASHINGTON, January 9.—Today's opening of the 2d session of the 89th Congress brings with it a call for some major changes in the Nation's maritime legislation—changes depending, of course, on whether the administration pursues the course promised by some of its lesserlings.

Whether much is done remains uncertain despite the two divergent reports on the American merchant marine that have aroused everyone in and around the maritime industry since last September.

This is the first time in recent maritime history—the last 30 years—that there has been so much turmoil over the industry in the months preceding the opening of Congress. It appears the path has been opened for major action.

In addition to dependence upon the administration's bidding, there will be the desires of Congress itself—whether the committees responsible for the merchant marine are prepared or are willing to take steps on their own.

The House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee will be headed by a new chairman—EDWARD A. GARMATZ, a Maryland Democrat. Senator MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington, a former seaman, will continue as chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee.

This could be the first time in the last few years that these two committees work together, inasmuch as MAGNUSON and the late Representative Bonner, Democrat, of North Carolina, whom GARMATZ succeeded, did not get along well together. Joining of hands in this direction could be fruitful for the industry and the program as a whole.

GARMATZ walks in as chairman at a time which affords him the opportunity as a whole to do more for the industry than his chairman has had since the 1936 act was passed.

He can also do his own constituents considerable good since they are so closely linked to the American maritime welfare—provided overall welfare is properly handled and GARMATZ has loyal persons working on it.

Since the 1936 act was passed, most of the legislation has been geared toward the subsidized end of the industry, which today is the best part of the American merchant marine. The tramps and independents did get the Cargo Preference Act, the trade-in-and-build program, and mortgage insurance when the Republicans were in power.

It is the tramp or bulk-carrier segment of the merchant marine that has been cited by both reports as requiring improvement at once. Although legislation was passed in 1952 enabling bulk carriers to be built with

subsidy assistance, the Maritime administration has not approved any of the applications filed in recent years for the construction of such sorely needed vessels.

Perhaps new legislation is not the complete answer. Perhaps a thorough investigation as to why the administration has not paid any heed to congressional wishes concerning the merchant fleet might be more in order.

The House Merchant Marine Committee has never been considered a particularly strong or important committee—primarily because the industry has never made itself recognized properly as a truly important industry to the United States.

Certainly over the years the industry has shied away from making the committee members feel as if they actually had done a job and had more to do.

Contributions to political campaigns from the shipping industry have always been considered in the "niggardly" class in congressional circles.

And now it has all come home—and the industry recognizes that, with the attitude of many administration officials, its future is dependent upon Congress.

Regardless of any of the past or any personal feelings, the congressional committees have a responsibility to the people of the United States to provide them with a strong American-flag merchant marine and a healthy maritime complex built around that fleet.

It is on that premise they should act.

CHANCE FOR HOUSE GROUP

The House Merchant Marine Committee can become a very important one on Capitol Hill this year if the overall picture is properly encompassed and presented.

As the second session opens, there is not only the question of a new policy for the American merchant marine, with two divergent reports serving as background, but there also is the fact that this country has found itself in rather a peculiar position in trying to supply ships to handle its own cargoes to Vietnam—although the reserve fleets are monumental in size.

And then there is the matter of the U.S.S. *Yarmouth Castle*, the Panama-flag passenger ship operating out of Miami on a regular run to Nassau, which burned with 90 persons—mostly Americans—losing their lives.

GOVERNMENT-AID CARGOES

Still undecided is whether U.S.-flag ships are receiving their share of Government-aid cargoes and, if not, why not.

All of these and more are matters that should be taken up by the congressional committees primarily responsible for the American merchant marine this year—first determining the adequacy of that fleet and how an adequate fleet can be maintained for this country so that when Vietnams break out there is no problem as to availability of merchant ships for both military and commercial use.

The committees might consider some way of finding out what is going on within the Maritime Administration. This might be something to consider as a permanent part of the committee staff work.

MAY NEED MORE STAFF

With the Yarmouth Castle disaster, the task force-Maritime Advisory Committee reports, and Vietnam, the House committee naturally must expand its staff to be able properly to handle all these matters.

Representative GARMATZ months ago asked for an accounting of the ships in the reserve fleet. As far as is known, he has never been given that information. If the information was kept on record as it should be and should have been, the new chairman could have had the proper answer to his request within a matter of days.

January 18, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A169

Yes, there is plenty to be done this year—and the merchant marine and maritime industry is looking to Congress to lead the way.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Jan. 12, 1966]

MERCHANT MARINE OF UNITED STATES THREATENED WITH OBLIVION
(By Helen Delich Bentley, maritime editor of the Sun)

WASHINGTON, January 11.—Commerce Department officials, it was learned today, have threatened subsidized shipowners that if they did not accept the interagency maritime task force report on a drastic new shipping policy, the American merchant marine "will be budgeted into oblivion."

This intimidation was made last month after Alan S. Boyd, Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation and task force chairman, in San Francisco called for a "compromise" on the two contradictory reports—that of the task force and the other of the President's Maritime Advisory Committee—on how the American-flag fleet should be rescued.

NEITHER SIDE GETTING ANYWHERE

Although Boyd was not present when the threat was made, two officials from his Department who presumably had authority to speak conducted the conference. The general tone of the session was that the ship operators should go through the task force report, find what "you can swallow," and the rest "would be forced upon the industry."

At the time of his call for a compromise, Boyd said before the maritime trades department of the AFL-CIO that neither side was getting anywhere holding fast to its views, that the United States had become great because throughout history there had been compromises, and he felt it was important for the future of the American merchant marine that a compromise be reached on the two policy reports.

It was when industry officials went to the Commerce Department to find out what was meant by the call to compromise that the warning was given to them.

The Commerce Department holds the key to the budget of the subsidized segment of the American merchant marine now because the Maritime Administration is an agency of that Department.

Therefore, whatever budget is sought by the Maritime Administration must then be fitted into the overall budget of the Commerce Department before it goes on to the Bureau of the Budget.

INDEPENDENT AGENCY SOUGHT

It is because of this hold of the Commerce Department over the merchant marine that several bills were introduced in the 1st session of the 89th Congress to have the Maritime Administration made an independent agency. Those bills are expected to be acted upon this session.

The Budget Bureau had representation on the task force, as did several other Government departments not considered friendly to the American merchant marine. Among the controversial recommendations in that report are the building of American ships abroad; phasing out of all American ships from the passenger business; revamping the entire system of subsidy payments; building new bulk carriers, but only five a year; and holding down the amount of foreign commerce to be transported on American-flag ships to less than the present 9 percent.

It also would have this country depend on foreign-flag ships for commercial purposes should all of the U.S.-flag vessels be used for military transportation.

ELEVEN SHIPS RECOMMENDED

Whether the reported cutback in new shipbuilding to be presented to Congress in the new budget is part of that threat cannot be determined yet.

According to information available, the Budget Bureau is recommending that only 11 new ships be built in fiscal 1967. This is the lowest number since the replacement program got fully underway in fiscal 1958. It is said to be 4 less than what the Commerce Department called for and about 10 or so less than what the Maritime Administration called for.

between Hanoi and Washington," which could cause a jamming of the White House switchboard. I have pointed out to him that you people have enough to do checking up on each other, and he has promised to think it over.

But to get back to my point of the incoming list not giving the big picture. A week ago Tuesday, for instance, I show up as calling Joe Califano 10 times between 11 a.m. and 7 p.m. I forget what I wanted to ask him, but the thing is he should not be credited—nor should I be charged—with the last two. I was merely trying to tell the secretary that my deadline had passed and that he should not bother to call back. The first time, all his lines were busy, and the second time, I got through.

The secretary promised to take my name off the list and she was as good as her word. I have not heard from him to this day.

Also you should not be misled by those six calls I put in to Bill Moyers on Thursday. He does not spend his day on the horn chipping with me. Actually, when I finally got him and asked him about the future of a prominent government official, he advised me not to write anything because the President will make a statement about it in a few days. I'm still waiting.

Knowing Washington, you are naturally concerned that some people might just be calling up their White House acquaintance to scrounge some juicy morsel to drop into the conversation over a Georgetown dinner party. Some of us, Mr. Watson, never get to Georgetown dinner parties. We are sitting in our offices waiting for the White House to call back.

A friend of mine went out recently and sat next to a White House aid who sees the President all day. His conversation was confined to the adorable thing his 2 year old had said that morning. His wife, during the ladies' hour, confided that she was going to name her next child Little Boy.

So, Mr. Watson, I can tell you there's no need to worry. Indiscretion has been practically wiped out in the executive branch. And your log of incoming calls would be cut right down to a splinter if you could persuade your boss to hold regular press conferences.

Sincerely yours,

Yellow Rose.

Yellow Rose Calls White House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1966

MR. YOUNGER. MR. Speaker, in the Sunday edition of the Washington Star of January 16, an article appeared which I am sure will be of interest to the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Mary McGrory's column "Yellow Rose Calls White House" is an excellent piece of satire on the White House order to report the comings and goings and phone calls of White House employees. Her column follows:

YELLOW ROSE CALLS WHITE HOUSE
(By Mary McGrory)

MR. MARVIN WATSON,
*Special Assistant to the President,
The White House.*

DEAR MR. WATSON: You know, of course, that Press Secretary Bill Moyers has explained and defended your practice of keeping a record of incoming telephone calls at the White House on the grounds of "efficiency, economy, and security."

Naturally all of us are for that, but as a patriotic American citizen I think I should tell you that you are barking up the wrong tree.

Take my own case. I show up on your lists as often as 20 times a day. But that's only half the story. What you need is the outgoing list. You'll never see me there.

No matter when I call or whom I call, he's "at a meeting" or "with the President" or "has some people with him." He's not spilling any state secrets to me, I can assure you. Maybe we should all take the hint that the

President will tell us reporters anything he thinks we ought to know, which you have to admit is not much. But we hear that a man's worth is gauged by the number of calls he gets, and he could lose his third telephone or even his job if he isn't in demand.

So we keep dialing, and I personally have had many pleasant conversations with the secretaries over there. I have learned that one of them is looking for an apartment on Connecticut Avenue and another is having trouble with her mother-in-law. I don't think these constitute breaches of the national security, and I hope you will agree.

Incidentally, would you consider giving us reporters code names or numbers? I have to spell my last name every time I call and it eats into my efficiency and also my morale. Could I be "Yellow Rose" or maybe 007? Or are you saving that for Walter Lippmann?

I want you to know that I have never descended to giving a fictitious name. A colleague of mine, whom I shall not name, on his sixth try for McGeorge Bundy, said he was Alexei Kosygin, and had to spell it.

Next week he plans to be "Alexander Kerensky," and the week after "Leon Trotsky." I think I have talked him out of using "Ho Chi Minh" on the grounds that it will start up a new flurry about "direct contact

As the Twig Is Bent—Safeguarding the Spiritual-Moral Well-being of Young Americans in Uniform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 18, 1966

MR. MUNDT. Mr. President, the February issue of Together, the magazine for Methodist families, carries an article by Col. Harry M. Archer which highlights the provisions being made by our military services for safeguarding the spiritual-moral well-being of young Americans in uniform.

Colonel Archer, a 20-year Army veteran, outlines clearly the factors in a young man's life which provide the keys to what kind of soldier and later, what kind of civilian, he will become.

Because of the importance of this article to those thousands of families who have sons in uniform I ask unanimous

A170

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

January 18, 1966

consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AS THE TWIG IS BENT

(By Harry C. Archer, colonel, U.S. Army)

Strange names once again are spreading across American headlines and creeping into the American vocabulary: Da Nang, Vietcong, and the Ho Chi Minh Trail. They are familiar because tens of thousands of our soldiers, airmen, and marines are pouring into beleaguered Vietnam. The buildup of combat forces there has brought increased draft call and may lead to the mobilization of Reserve and National Guard units.

The demands of national security made upon the young men of our Nation are of obvious and direct concern to parents, clergymen, civic leaders—indeed to all Americans.

The first though, of course, is for the physical safety and well-being of these lads. No less important is the concern over the effects of military service upon their moral fiber. Will they be coarsened and corrupted? Or will they emerge as self-reliant, better citizens?

As a soldier, a Regular Army officer, I have my own views. To illustrate, let me present an imagined but not unbelievable case:

The young soldier was not particularly drunk when he left the cafe. Just happy. He had had only a few beers. The girl lounging outside strolled up to him and struck a provocative pose. They chatted a few moments and then, with a shrug, the boy nodded and together they set off down the dimly lit street. Ten minutes later he was dead. They had not meant to kill him, just rob him. But there had been a scuffle, and now the soldier was very, very dead, lying in a foul-smelling alley thousands of miles from home and family.

Would such an incident have happened if the boy had not been drafted into military service? Of course that particular incident would not have occurred, but what about one like it? Would he have been as likely to drift off in an alcoholic haze with some other such girl? Was there, perhaps, some flaw in his character from earlier days, or did the Army cause him to follow this path?

After all, everyone who has read "From Here to Eternity" knows what the military services are like—sex-crazed, hard-drinking, profane, and completely controlled by sadistic sergeants and incompetent officers. Such an environment is bound to corrupt.

Balderdash. Let me lay it on the line for you, parents of America. With but a few exceptions, the boy coming out of the military is the same basic product that you created. So you want a good, clean kid to come home from the Army? It is easy. Just put a good, clean kid into the Army.

I am not being flippant. I have been in the Army more than 20 years, and I have seen the American serviceman at work and at play in the United States and in nearly 30 foreign lands. Some of them started using narcotics while others started building an orphanage. One man dealt in stolen black-market goods, and the Army dealt him a dishonorable discharge. Another from the same platoon attended night school, receiving a high school diploma with his honorable discharge.

What made the difference? They were in the same army. Could the difference lie in the moral training they received before they came into the service? If it were not so trite, I would answer my own question with that old chestnut about "As the twig is bent." On second thought, I'll say it anyway. As the twig is bent, so grows the tree, and you had better believe it.

FOUR KEY FACTORS

In the military, there appear to be four main factors that determine whether a twig will bend or grow straight—factors that determine how each young man will respond to the challenges of military life. It should come as no surprise that all four are directly connected with the home and community from which he came. The things which shape a lad's early life also tend to shape his career in uniform.

Here are the four factors:

Religion: The truly devout soldier is rarely in trouble. Even those who have relaxed somewhat in their church attendance are good risks if they have a background of sound Christian or Jewish training. Respect for the laws of God and man, as taught by the religious faiths, is the firmest foundation upon which to build a good soldier and a good citizen. The boys who take part in church activities and who have learned to seek their chaplain's guidance seldom see the inside of a military police station.

Family: The products of unhappy or broken homes have some tendency to have unhappy, broken military careers. I do not mean that such a boy is an odd-on favorite to be a troublemaker. The vast majority of all soldiers serve honorably and well. Only a small handful is given dishonorable discharges. I simply mean that a boy who grew up with the love and guidance of two well-adjusted parents has a better chance of a satisfying career.

Education: The better the education, the better the soldier. There is a direct, almost invariable connection. The reasons are easily understood.

First, the well-educated soldier is assigned to better, more interesting duties. Often he is selected to attend highly technical schools which not only qualify him for promotion and better assignments but also prepare him for good jobs in civilian life. The educated soldier knows that receiving such opportunities depends in part upon his personal conduct.

Second, the better-schooled soldier has a clearer understanding of why he is in the Army, why there must be a draft. If he is stationed in Europe, for example, he has some knowledge of American foreign policy and of why our Government believes that U.S. forces must be maintained there. Knowing these things, he has a sense of purpose and accomplishment that is not fully shared by less fortunate fellows.

Last, he tends to associate with other well-educated soldiers. As a group, they are the ones most frequently seen in the post library, the chapel, the education center, and the craft shop—and more rarely seen in the nightclubs and bars that spawn disciplinary problems.

The girl friend: If a boy has won the love or affection of a girl back home, he is more likely to be a good soldier. If they are engaged, this influence is even stronger. A picture in the wallet, letters ending with little X's and O's—these are forces which never should be underestimated. The boy who wants a particular girl to be proud of him knows she will not be proud if his service is dishonorable. The lad in love is more apt to be economy minded. He saves his money for their future home, for gifts, or to squire the girl around when he returns home on leave. Such a soldier will spend less money, hence less time, in the cabarets that frequently cluster about military installations.

The letters from this all-important girl are a factor in themselves. If they are affectionate and chatty, speaking of familiar places and people, they are a strong link with all the more wholesome, desirable things in his life.

This matter of love is a double-edged sword, however. If the girl spurns him or turns to another, strange forces are some-

times loosened. While one boy might sit in his barracks to brood over his fate, another may embark upon a wave of rashness, turning to the consolation of alcohol or the arms of some other, too readily available girl. Which course he follows is determined by other factors of religious training, home life, and education.

Note that I have not mentioned such things as the soldier's race, social, or economic position, his national origin, or rural versus urban background. Perhaps statistical study would reveal that some of these are important, but in my experience they are not. Give me a religious, educated boy from a happy home with a wholesome girl in his heart, and I have a good soldier. I do not care if he is black, white, or purple, rich or poor; he will serve honorably and well and will return to his community as a good man and a good citizen.

FEAR OF CORRUPT INFLUENCES

Why do so many people fear the effects of military service on their sons or relatives? To my mind, the reasons are clear. In the first place, there are the newspaper headlines: "Soldier Rapes Teenager"; "Five Marines Killed in 100-m.p.h. Police Chase." How often do you see headlines blaring, "Salesman Robs Bank" or "Bus Driver Slays Rival"? Rarely. And it is not because all salesmen and all bus drivers are above approach.

Exceptions are made, of course, when a civilian's crime is completely inconsistent with his occupation: "Choir Director Arrested in Opium Den" or "Bank President Charged With Shoplifting." As a rule, however, civil occupations are not headlined.

Why the difference? I believe it is because of the uniform. It provides a visible identity found in few other occupations. Policemen also wear uniforms, and I can well picture a headline proclaiming, "Policeman Slays Wife," but I cannot imagine one announcing, "Grocer Killed in Three-Car Accident." In short, I believe the headlines give a grossly distorted picture of the serviceman's standard of conduct.

There is a second, more concrete reason for parents to fear the corrupting influence of military life. After all, Jimmy did not smoke or use swear words before he went into the Army, and now he does both. Proof positive. Well, what would have happened to Jimmy if, instead of entering the Army, he had left home for the first time to attend some large university or to work for a construction company? Would he then have been less likely to smoke and say dammit? No matter where he goes, a lad will pick up superficial signs of toughness when he goes out into the world of men. I do not believe military life is any worse or any better in this regard than a thousand other occupations.

OBLIGATIONS OF THE MILITARY

It may appear that I wish to absolve the military services of any responsibility for the conduct of our citizen-soldiers. That is not my desire nor is it the desire of any officer I know. The service branches have a deep feeling of obligation to do their share in preserving and further developing the moral stamina of their men. The reasons are both idealistic and practical.

On the idealistic side, we in the services do not regard ourselves as being basically separate or different from the rest of the American community. As children, we, too, played marbles, went fishing, came home with bloody noses, and loved the smell of burning leaves. Putting on a uniform did not mean that we suddenly became indifferent to all but the military aspects of American life. We are citizens as well as soldiers, and we feel civic as well as military obligations.

January 18, 1966

Standard errors of estimated percentages (68 chances out of 100)

Estimated percentage	Base of percentage (thousands)								
	75	125	250	500	1,000	2,500	5,000	10,000	25,000
2 or 98	3.4	2.6	1.8	1.3	0.9	0.6	0.4	0.3	0.2
5 or 95	5.1	4.0	2.8	2.0	1.4	.8	.6	.4	.3
10 or 90	6.7	5.4	3.8	2.7	2.0	1.2	.8	.6	.4
15 or 85	8.3	6.4	4.6	3.2	2.3	1.4	1.0	.7	.4
20 or 80	9.3	7.2	5.1	3.6	2.5	1.6	1.1	.8	.5
25 or 75	10.0	7.8	5.5	3.9	2.8	1.8	1.3	.8	.6
35 or 65	11.1	8.6	6.1	4.3	3.1	2.0	1.4	.9	.6
50	11.8	9.0	6.4	4.5	3.2	2.0	1.4	1.0	.7

On Congressional Travel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 18, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article concerning the value of travel by the Members of the Congress.

The article was written by the Honorable Douglas MacArthur II, the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations and one of the most able men serving our Nation.

The article appeared in the November 1965 Department of State Newsletter and follows:

MACARTHUR: ON CONGRESSIONAL TRAVEL
(By Douglas MacArthur II)

I have long believed, and my present assignment has confirmed me in that belief, that there are few areas in which the Department and the Foreign Service have greater opportunities for constructive accomplishment than in dealing with the Congress.

During the postwar era, it has become increasingly apparent: that our foreign policy cannot be successfully executed without full congressional support; that the congressional role in foreign policy is growing in scope and complexity; that this is a legitimate and necessary development in the conduct of a leadership foreign policy by a democracy; and that the demands which this growth makes on the Department are matched only by the demands it places on the Members of Congress themselves.

Our function, of course, is not—and indeed never was—to resist congressional participation in the policymaking process, but rather to welcome it and to help make it an efficient and mutually profitable one—for the Department and the Service, the Congress, and above all, for the American people whose interests we all serve.

There are countless ways in which this is being done here in Washington, such as: increased briefings of Members and committee staffs; greater contact by Members of Congress with the Diplomatic Corps and foreign visitors; assigning junior and middle grade FSO's to brief tours of duty in congressional offices; and the heightened and encouraging departmental effectiveness in the handling of congressional correspondence.

A major area of immediate opportunity for increased understanding is the field of congressional travel. The misguided tendency to regard congressional travel duties as an annoying chore is, happily, a disappearing one. Those of us who have had repeated opportunities to deal with traveling Members of Congress and their principal staff assist-

ants have learned that congressional travel, if handled properly and with imagination, can be a great source of benefit to the Department as well as to the Congress.

Perhaps even more important for our FSO's in the field, it presents a unique opportunity to acquaint Members in detail with the problems we are facing abroad and thus engage their understanding and support. At the same time it gives those in the field a new insight into the concerns and worries of the American people and their elected Representatives in the field of foreign affairs.

It is difficult to imagine people who have heavier demands on their time and energies than Members of our Congress. They have their subcommittee work, their committee work, quorum calls, rollcalls, national problems, the problems of their constituencies, and a seemingly never-ending stream of visitors from their home district or State. Many of them simply do not have as much time as they would like when they are in Washington to devote to foreign affairs. When they travel abroad, on the other hand, they are free of many of these pressures and do have the time to focus on important foreign policy problems.

Contrary to the impression given in some irresponsible quarters, congressional travel abroad is neither frivolous nor insignificant, and I for one would recommend that every Member travel as much as his schedule will permit. It is a serious responsibility of their office enabling them to gather important material for further legislative work as well as deeper understanding of the great issues of war and peace in a troubled world. It is the occasion for them to observe at first hand how the Foreign Service functions and how, and why, our various programs overseas are working. My experience, and I am sure yours, has been that they are, almost without exception, eager to take advantage of this opportunity.

It is thus vitally important that our officers make the most of this chance to show the Service at its best as an effective and efficient instrument. We can give Members first-hand experiences that they can draw upon in responding to their constituents' questions or criticisms about the Service as well as about programs and policies.

The proper care and handling of congressional visitors is a task that demands the priority attention and best performance of everyone in the Service from the Chief of Mission right on down. Nothing less than this will do.

People and Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1966

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, it is not often a Member of Congress has the

opportunity and pleasure to discuss a concrete action program instituted by interested citizens because they saw a need and decided to meet it. I have that distinct pleasure today, Mr. Speaker.

A group of interested citizens of Lincoln, Nebr., have for some time been concerned with the phenomenal increase in crime in the United States and have decided that citizen action is one of the few really long-term, effective methods available to counteract this national disease.

Mr. Speaker, Lincoln, Nebr., is not faced with the massive increase in crime that has plagued other areas of the country. But any crime is too much and Lincoln is a growing city and planning for the future has always been one of its trademarks.

The Lincoln Junior Chamber of Commerce, led by a member of my human resources committee, Mr. Ben Goble, has devised PAL which stands for people and law. An individual citizen may become a member for a small membership fee and participate in the activities of the organization—all of which are supported by the dues and other donations.

PAL will publish periodic bulletins on law enforcement, crime statistics, how the individual citizen may aid law enforcement officials, and training programs. In addition, PAL will sponsor a monthly award to a local law enforcement official who has distinguished himself as an officer and a citizen, sponsor a scholarship fund to be used by a student in the field of law, criminology or other related fields, and act as a resource group to promote the coordination and dissemination of information pertaining to law enforcement activities to schools, civic, service, and religious groups.

I commend the idea to those in other areas who face far greater problems in the area of rising crime rates.



Report on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, following the adjournment of Congress it was my privilege to make a study tour of southeast Asia, including Vietnam. This trip was not made as a

January 18, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A191

TABLE 3.—Money income in 1964 of noninstitutional male war veterans in the United States, who worked at part-year, part-time jobs, by age

Money income in 1964	Total	Age in March 1965							
		25 to 34 years	35 to 44 years	45 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 years and over			
						Total	65 to 69 years	70 to 74 years	75 years and over
Number (thousands)	3,048	544	1,491	837	286	489	280	184	125
Percent, by income	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Under \$500	3.8	4.3	3.4	4.0	8.7	1.0	(2)	2.4	
\$500 to \$999	4.8	1.5	5.1	5.9	6.8	3.9	2.8	4.9	
\$1,000 to \$1,499	5.8	8.0	3.0	6.1	10.7	6.7	7.3	5.7	
\$1,500 to \$1,999	5.2	2.8	4.1	3.8	6.3	11.5	11.9	10.6	
\$2,000 to \$2,499	7.1	6.8	5.5	7.0	5.3	13.5	11.3	18.7	
\$2,500 to \$2,999	6.4	3.7	5.8	4.0	6.3	15.3	15.8	13.8	
\$3,000 to \$3,499	7.0	4.6	6.7	8.7	5.8	8.8	13.0	3.2	
\$3,500 to \$3,999	6.2	6.7	7.1	4.5	3.9	7.8	4.5	11.4	
\$4,000 to \$4,499	6.7	8.0	6.1	7.3	6.8	6.1	9.1	2.4	
\$4,500 to \$4,999	5.5	4.6	5.8	7.0	6.8	2.9	4.0	1.6	
\$5,000 to \$5,499	7.4	10.4	7.7	7.5	5.8	4.3	2.8	5.7	
\$5,500 to \$5,999	4.0	4.9	4.2	4.0	2.0	3.5	5.1	1.6	
\$6,000 to \$6,999	9.5	15.3	11.2	9.4	2.4	3.1	1.7	4.1	
\$7,000 to \$7,999	6.4	5.8	8.3	6.1	6.8	1.2	1.1	1.6	
\$8,000 to \$8,999	5.2	4.9	5.9	5.2	7.8	1.8	1.1	3.3	
\$9,000 to \$9,999	2.7	3.7	3.2	2.5	1.0	1.8	1.1	3.3	
\$10,000 to \$14,999	4.0	4.0	3.8	4.2	3.9	4.5	5.1	4.1	
\$15,000 to \$24,999	2.0	(2)	2.1	1.9	2.9	2.3	2.3	1.6	
\$25,000 and over	.3	(2)	.2	.9	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	
Median ¹									
	\$4,270	\$4,900	\$4,710	\$4,410	\$3,540	\$2,940	\$3,042	\$2,740	

¹ Distribution and median not shown when base is less than 100,000.² Rounds to zero.³ Computed from unrounded data and rounded to the nearest \$10.

TABLE 4.—Money income in 1964 of noninstitutional male war veterans in the United States who did not work, by age

Money income in 1964	Total	Age in March 1965							
		25 to 34 years	35 to 44 years	45 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 years and over			
						Total	65 to 69 years	70 to 74 years	75 years and over
Number (thousands)	1,784	157	18	171	157	1,281	519	572	190
Percent, by income	100.0					100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Under \$500	7.4		16.7	22.0	5.9	3.8	4.9	2.1	5.6
\$500 to \$999	8.5		18.0	16.1	15.1	5.8	3.6	5.8	11.7
\$1,000 to \$1,499	15.4		18.0	8.5	14.3	16.3	13.6	10.3	23.5
\$1,500 to \$1,999	15.1		7.7	13.6	14.3	16.4	19.1	15.0	13.0
\$2,000 to \$2,499	21.1		2.6	13.6	12.6	25.1	24.6	24.5	29.0
\$2,500 to \$2,999	7.8		6.4	4.2	10.9	8.3	6.7	10.5	5.6
\$3,000 to \$3,499	6.3		(2)	4.2	7.6	7.2	8.5	7.4	3.1
\$3,500 to \$3,999	3.0		2.6	2.5	2.5	3.0	3.7	2.9	1.8
\$4,000 to \$4,499	3.3		11.5	6.8	4.2	2.0	1.5	2.6	1.8
\$4,500 to \$4,999	1.8		(2)	3.4	(2)	2.1	1.5	2.4	2.5
\$5,000 to \$5,499	2.4		2.6	(2)	3.4	2.3	2.1	2.9	1.2
\$5,500 to \$5,999	.5		2.5	(2)	1.7	.2	.6	(2)	(2)
\$6,000 to \$6,999	1.8		3.8	1.7	(2)	1.6	2.7	1.1	(2)
\$7,000 to \$7,999	.9		2.5	1.7	1.7	.6	.6	.8	(2)
\$8,000 to \$8,999	.6		2.6	(2)	(2)	.6	.9	.5	(2)
\$9,000 to \$9,999	.9		(2)	(2)	(2)	1.2	.6	1.8	1.2
\$10,000 to \$14,999	1.9		2.5	(2)	3.3	2.2	2.7	2.4	(2)
\$15,000 to \$24,999	.8		(2)	1.7	2.5	.6	.9	.5	(2)
\$25,000 and over	.5		(2)	(2)	(2)	.7	1.2	.5	(2)
Median ³									
	\$2,090			\$1,410	\$1,630	\$2,010	\$2,160	\$2,180	\$1,870

¹ Distribution and median not shown when base is less than 100,000.² Rounds to zero.³ Computed from unrounded data and rounded to the nearest \$10.

SOURCE AND RELIABILITY OF THE ESTIMATES

Source of data

Information about the 1964 income of male civilian noninstitutional war veterans in the United States was derived from the Bureau of the Census' March 1965 Current Population Survey sample of approximately 25,000 households. The income distributions by age were applied to the independent VA estimates by age of the male civilian noninstitutional war veteran population in the United States to develop the income data presented in this report. Although income data are for the year 1964, the age refers to March 1965. (For details of the survey see "Consumer Income, Current Population Reports," series P-60, No. 47, Sept. 24, 1965, U.S. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C.)

War veterans are men who served in the Armed Forces during a war period (Spanish-

American War, World War I, World War II, Korean conflict), have been separated from active duty and are now in the civilian noninstitutional population. The civilian noninstitutional population excludes all members of the Armed Forces, and inmates of penal institutions, chronic disease hospitals, nursing homes, and the like.

Reliability of the estimates

Since the estimates are based on a sample, they may differ somewhat from the figures that would have been obtained if a complete census had been taken using the same schedules, instructions, and enumerators. As in any survey work, the results are subject to errors of response and of reporting, as well as being subject to sampling variability.

The standard error is primarily a measure of sampling variability; that is, of the varia-

tions that occur by chance because a sample rather than the whole of the population is surveyed. As calculated for this report, the standard error also partially measures the effects of response and enumeration errors but does not measure any systematic biases in the data. The chances are about 68 out of 100 that an estimate from the sample will differ from a complete census figure by less than one standard error. The chances are about 95 out of 100 that the difference would be less than twice the standard error. The following table shows the approximate standard error of an estimated percentage computed by using sample data for both the numerator and denominator of the percentage. The size of the standard error depends upon both the size of the percentage and the size of the class upon which the percentage is based.

January 18, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A193

part of any committee, but at my own expense so that I could report to the people of the Seventh District of Alabama, the situation in Vietnam as I saw it from firsthand inspection.

Upon my return I issued a report to my constituents on Vietnam and, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD I would like to include that report. Of course, there have been later developments since my return from Vietnam, including the massive peace drive launched by the President over the Christmas period.

I believe we should do all possible to seek a peaceful solution to the war in Vietnam and I find no fault in the efforts to do so. My concern is, that in our intense desire for peace that we may settle for less than victory. I would hate to think that Vietnam will become another Korea and that 12 years from now we will still have thousands of American boys still stationed in those jungles to maintain a peace that is not really a peace, but rather a stalemate. I would hate to think that we would get a peace in Vietnam by giving in to the Communists as we did in Laos and permit a Communist takeover under the guise of a coalition government.

We should be prepared to negotiate, but at the same time we should maintain our strength, our capacity for victory and make sure that the enemy knows we have that capacity and will use it if forced to do so by their failure to end their aggression.

My report on Vietnam, which was released in December, follows:

SPECIAL REPORT ON VIETNAM

(By JIM MARTIN, Member of Congress)

The cold war between the Communist conspiracy and the free world has become a hot and blazing war in Vietnam. Contrary to the statements of the pacifist and pro-Communist demonstrators, the war in South Vietnam is not a civil war against a tyrannical government. It is naked aggression of South Vietnam by Communist North Vietnam, encouraged and supported by Red China and Soviet Russia. I have just traveled more than 20,000 miles through all of Asia and into the Middle East for a firsthand investigation. This report is based on conditions as I found them in my tours of the villages of Korea, Taiwan, South Vietnam, Thailand, and India; through briefings by our civilian and military leaders and through lengthy conversations with the businessmen, industrialists, political leaders, and the people of all the countries I visited.

Any study of the war in Vietnam must begin with the stated creed of the Communist leaders of Red China. Mao Tse-tung, head of the Communist Party in China, has stated:

"Every Communist must grasp the truths. Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun. Whoever has an army has power, for war settles everything. The theory of war and strategy is the core of everything."

Every action of Red China has been based on that creed. They have attempted to stir up discontent and revolution in both Africa and Asia and where subversion did not work, they resorted to upright aggression as in Korea and now in Vietnam. This is the enemy we face, and the Communist goal of world domination has never changed. Even now the only differences between Red China and Soviet Russia is on how to accomplish the goal. The Russian leaders believe the world can be subverted through subtle means

while the Chinese leaders believe in the hard core Communist line of Lenin and Stalin, that the world must be conquered through war.

My first impression in my travel through Asia was the lesson of Korea. We may be making the same mistake in Vietnam. Twelve years after the armistice in Korea, the United States still has 50,000 American soldiers there facing the Communist enemy eyeball to eyeball across the 38th parallel. Our military was prevented from winning the war in Korea because of political decisions which gave enemy forces a safe sanctuary in Chinese territory across the Yalu River and because they were prevented from bombing the supply lines leading into North Korea from Red China.

Today, in Vietnam our military forces are facing many of the same restrictions. We cannot win the war in Vietnam by sending American boys into the gristmill formed by the countless thousands of North Vietnamese and Red Chinese which can be thrown against them from safe sanctuaries in Red China, Cambodia, and Laos. It is clear to me, and I am convinced my views are shared by our generals and commanding officers in Vietnam, that we should win the war and then negotiate the political problems.

We can win the war if we give the military the authority to win it. First. We should blockade the harbor at Hal Phong, mining it if necessary and warning all nations that no more material of war will be permitted. Second. We should authorize the Air Force to bomb strategic military targets such as the two railroads and mountain passes in North Vietnam which are direct routes for shipping war supplies into North Vietnam from China. We should also bomb military airfields, actual missile sites wherever they are located even within the safe sanctuary around Hanoi. Bombing targets should also include munitions factories as well as gasoline and fuel storage tanks, all of which are now out of bounds for our Air Force within certain restricted areas. Third. We should make clear to any enemy troops threatening the South Vietnamese that there will be no sanctuary from which they may safely invade. The United States has the potential forces to smash the Communist enemy in Vietnam, and we should assure our commanding general there that he will be given whatever forces and supplies necessary to win. The military is ready—the American people are in support of a policy to win—it is up to the administration to give the word.

CLEAR POLICY BACKED BY DEEDS IS NEEDED

While the hot war is in Vietnam, we cannot isolate one single country in Asia. The target of Red China is all of Asia, then Africa, and finally, the world. Like it or not, the United States is looked to for leadership by those nations and those people who still hope to remain free. From my conversations with people in all walks of life in the countries I visited, I find that the people of Asia are concerned about our intentions and our willingness to back our words with deeds. They are not sure we will stick with them when the chips are down. They are afraid of another stalemate such as Korea. They are afraid we may withdraw our troops before the victory is won. The statement by the Secretary of Defense prior to the last election that "we will bring the boys home from Vietnam by Christmas," caused a shattering blow to the morale of the South Vietnamese. Feeling that we were getting ready to pull out, many of the village chiefs and others in South Vietnam prepared to make peace with the Vietcong. Sharing the belief that we would not stay, the Vietcong were able to consolidate their hold on nearly 80 percent of the land and the people of South Vietnam. In addition, American mothers were given the false hope that their boys would not have to fight. We are paying in blood for this mistake in judgment.

We must make it clear that the United States stands with all those who want to be free and are determined to fight for their freedom. Then we must show by deed, that is by force of arms and determination, that we are prepared to win the war in Vietnam and meet head on any future Communist aggression.

TRIP NO EXPENSE TO GOVERNMENT

In the months ahead I will report to you in greater detail on my tour of inspection. I would like to make two things clear. This trip was made at my expense. My administrative assistant accompanied me and he, too, paid his own way—as did Mr. Wallace Malone of Dothan. The trip was made with the encouragement of the Department of State and the commanding officers in the field because they feel it is most important that Members of Congress see at first hand actual conditions in Vietnam, the need for all-out effort, and the manner in which our troops are meeting the challenge.

Job Corps Has Backer in Flint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**HON. JOHN C. MACKIE**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1966

MR. MACKIE. Mr. Speaker, the Office of Economic Opportunity's Job Corps program is starting to pay dividends.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to read the following excellent story on one Job Corps graduate that appeared recently in the Flint, Mich., Journal.

The tax dollars used to train Leonard Hamilton will, I am sure, be repaid a hundredfold in the years ahead. The money being spent on the war on poverty is one of the best investments America can make in its future:

[From the Flint (Mich.) Journal, Dec. 26, 1965]

JOB CORP HAS BACKER IN FLINT

(By Herschel P. Fink)

Six months ago Leonard Hamilton had trouble finding a job.

He was 20 years old and had dropped out of school after the 10th grade. For a while he worked as a janitor. Then he found work clearing construction sites of weeds and pop bottles. Sometimes he couldn't find work.

Today, Hamilton sits at a draftsman's table in a brightly lighted office at Consumers Power Co. He has a trade that he hopes will mean the start of a new life for him.

The Job Corps, part of President Johnson's war on poverty, gave Hamilton the chance to do something for himself. He is the first graduate of a Job Corps camp to return to the Flint area.

Since last May, about 30 area men, aged 16 to 21, have gone to Job Corps camps around the country for training. Many of them, like Hamilton, were high school dropouts who found that their lack of job skills made them virtually unemployable or suited only for menial labor.

Hamilton looked at the Job Corps as "my last hope." He heard about it while watching television last April and applied at the Michigan Employment Security Commission's Flint office, 706 North Street.

In June, he was assigned to the Gary Job Corps Center in San Marcos, Tex.

At the camp, Hamilton was allowed to choose from a variety of skills being taught. He picked a drafting course. Besides job

A194

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

January 18, 1966

training, corpsmen take remedial arithmetic and English classes.

Pay in the Job Corps is \$80 a month. The Government places \$50 of that in a bank account for the corpsman which can be collected when he leaves the center.

Although corpsmen are given 2 years to complete their training, Hamilton wasted no time. He completed the course last month.

Thomas J. Tomaskovich, employment service supervisor for the Flint MESC office, said that Hamilton completed the drafting course "with honors."

Hamilton's Job Corps report rated him "excellent in connection with his potential in the drafting field."

Tomaskovich, also reported that Hamilton's progress at the camp was so rapid he was offered a job as an assistant instructor.

"But I was in a hurry to get back and get to work," Hamilton recalls.

On the strength of his Job Corps record, Hamilton was offered a job by Consumers as an engineering clerk. His department lays out power and gas distribution lines. In the job he will use his drafting skills to make layouts.

"The job usually requires a high school diploma and drafting experience," said Ward W. Bloxson, personnel and safety supervisor at Consumers. "We felt, however, that based on his outstanding record in the Job Corps—one of the highest there—he qualified for a chance."

Hamilton considers joining the Job Corps "one of the best things a boy can do if he wants to learn."

Life at the Job Corps camp wasn't easy, he said, "but if you want to do something bad enough, you learn to take the bad with the good."

He emphasizes that a youth "has to want to learn, to profit from the Job Corps."

He is happy about his decision to join.

"When things get hard, you can't get unskilled work. But when you've got a trade, you don't have much to worry about."

Hamilton doesn't plan to end his education with his Job Corps graduation. He hopes to take advantage of a Consumers' program which will pay 75 percent of college tuition costs. He wants to take classes at Flint Junior College. Eventually, he would like to earn a college degree.

Gen. James M. Gavin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, one of America's great soldier-statesmen is Gen. James M. Gavin. A beribboned World War II paratroop commander, General Gavin was a strong exponent of more aerial mobility for ground troops. This sky cavalry concept is now being used effectively by the United States in Vietnam.

After distinguished service as our Ambassador to France, General Gavin returned to the United States. He is now president of that eminent research firm, Arthur D. Little, Inc., of Cambridge, Mass.

In a letter appearing in the February 1966 issue of Harper's magazine, the general warns that a massive buildup of

U.S. forces in Vietnam could prompt Red China to send troops there and reopen the Korean war as well. He also emphasized:

To increase the bombing and to bomb Hanoi—or even Peiping—will add to our problems rather than detract from them, and it will not stop the penetrations of North Vietnam troops into the South.

I concur with the general's view of this matter. Indeed, it was this conviction that motivated me to join recently with 16 of my House colleagues in writing the President to express our vigorous opposition to those, including Richard Nixon and Barry Goldwater, who have urged the United States to extend its bombings to the Hanoi area.

General Gavin also makes the following vital point. He said that the 190,000 U.S. troops already in the Vietnam theater would suffice "if we should maintain enclaves on the coast, desist in our bombing attacks on North Vietnam, and seek to find a solution through the United Nations or a conference in Geneva."

This proposal is similar to one made some months ago and repeated since then by the distinguished Columnist Walter Lippmann.

And the Washington Post, in an editorial Sunday, January 16, took a similar approach:

It is our purpose—

The Post declared—

to deny North Vietnam the fruits of a war of national liberation, and we can do that by successfully holding the areas now occupied and slowly and persistently enlarging them by territorial sweeps instead of jungle pursuit.

Under leave to extend my remarks and include extraneous matter, I include here an Associated Press report on General Gavin's letter which appeared in the Washington Post of January 17, and the Post's editorial of January 16:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 17, 1966]

GAVIN SAYS HANOI BOMBING COULD BRING IN PEIPING UNITS

NEW YORK, January 16.—Gen. James M. Gavin declared today a massive buildup of U.S. forces in Vietnam may prompt Red China to send troops there and reopen the Korean war as well.

The 58-year-old former chief of U.S. Army research and development suggested that America concentrate instead on holding major bases along the South Vietnam coast while diplomats seek an end to the fighting.

In a letter appearing in the February issue of Harper's magazine, Gavin said:

"To increase the bombing and to bomb Hanoi—or even Peiping—will add to our problems rather than detract from them, and it will not stop the penetrations of North Vietnam troops into the south.

"Also, if we were to quadruple, for example, our combat forces there, we should then anticipate the intervention of Chinese 'volunteers' and the reopening of the Korean front.

ESCALATION SEEN LIKELY

"This seems to be the ultimate prospect of the course that we are now on."

Gavin said the 190,000 U.S. troops already in the Vietnam theater would suffice "if we should maintain enclaves on the coast, desist in our bombing attacks on North Vietnam, and seek to find a solution through the United Nations or a conference in Geneva."

He asserted that an attempt to make all of South Vietnam secure from the Communists "would take many times as much force as we now have in Vietnam"—and risk a fresh outbreak of Red Chinese aggression in the Korean pattern.

"I do not for a moment think that if we should withdraw from Vietnam the next stop would be Waikiki," Gavin said. "The Kra Peninsula, Thailand, and the Philippines can all be secured, although we ultimately might have heavy fighting on the northern frontiers of Thailand."

Emphasizing that he spoke "solely from a military-technical point of view," Gavin recalled that he was Chief of U.S. Army plans and operations at the time of the French military disaster in Dienbienphu.

He said Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, then Chief of Staff, "directed that we go into the situation quite thoroughly in case a decision should be made to send U.S. forces into the Hanoi delta."

"The more we studied the situation," Gavin wrote, "the more we realized that we were, in fact, considering going to war with China, since she was supplying all the arms, ammunition, medical, and other supplies to Ho Chi Minh.

"If we would be, in fact, fighting China, then we were fighting her in the wrong place on terms entirely to her advantage."

Gavin said southeast Asia is no place to take on Red China in military combat.

"Manchuria, with its vast industrial complex, coal, and iron ore, is the Ruhr of China and the heart of its war-making capacity," he said. "There, rather than in southeast Asia, is where China should be engaged, if at all."

SHOWDOWN NOT YET DUE

Gavin added that if Red China continues aggression and arms itself with nuclear weapons "the time may come when China will bring upon herself a nuclear war. But that time is not here yet."

Gavin, a paratroop commander in World War II, retired from the Army in 1958 because of differences with the Eisenhower administration over modernizing the Armed Forces. He was a particularly strong exponent of more aerial mobility for ground troops.

Gavin called this "the sky cavalry concept, which we are now employing in South Vietnam" and commented:

"When I retired in 1958, I said that I would be happy to serve as a private in the Army if it were the kind of an Army that I wanted it to be.

"I think it is that kind of an Army now. * * *

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 16, 1966]

AFTER THE PAUSE

The President very wisely has put no terminal date on his peace offensive or on the pause in air operations against the North while the peace efforts go forward. Since there has been no known response from Hanoi, either affirmative or negative, it is too early to say whether there will be any results. Sooner or later, if there are no negotiations at all, consideration will have to be given to the next military moves.

There is a powerful impulse in the Congress, in the country, and in some places in the executive department, for a resumption of air activity and for an initiation of full-scale warfare against the North to put a speedy end to a disagreeable war. Powerful as this impulse is, and strong as the support may be for the use of more military muscle, it is to be hoped that the President will reject the counsels of those who wish to escalate the war. There is not much reason to believe that an unlimited air war would achieve decisive results. North Vietnam does not present the kind of industrial tar-